

2008

A Replication Study: New York Public High School Principals' Attitudes On The Impact Of Tenure On Principal Performance

Raymond Gary Cooper
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cooper, Raymond Gary, "A Replication Study: New York Public High School Principals' Attitudes On The Impact Of Tenure On Principal Performance" (2008). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 117.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/117>

A REPLICATION STUDY: NEW YORK PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS'
ATTITUDES ON THE IMPACT OF TENURE ON PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE
BY
RAYMOND GARY COOPER

Dissertation Committee

Mary F. Ruzicka, Ph. D., Mentor
James M. Caulfield, Ed. D.
Lois R. Favre, Ed. D.
Paul R. Semendinger, Ed. D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University
2008

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

Doctoral Candidate, **Raymond Cooper**, has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the **Ed.D.** during this **Spring Semester 2008**.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE
(please sign and date beside your name)

Mentor:

Dr. Mary Ruzicka

M. Ruzicka

Committee Member:

Dr. James Caulfield

James E. Caulfield 3/11/08

Committee Member:

Dr. Lois Favre

Lois R. Favre

Committee Member:

Dr. Paul Semendinger

Paul Semendinger

External Reader:

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

ABSTRACT

A Replication Study: New York Public High School Principals' Attitudes on the Impact of Tenure on Principal Performance

The purpose of this study was to (a) determine the attitudes of active public high school principals as they relate to tenure and principal effectiveness, (b) determine if there is a difference between the attitudes of tenured and nontenured principals as they relate to tenured principal effectiveness, and (c) determine if tenure status plays a role in current principals' decision-making process. The responses of a sample of 28 principals located in New York to a 16-item Internet-based survey were examined in order to address these objectives. The majority of principals reported a belief that tenure is necessary. Moreover, a majority of principals suggested that tenure increased their effectiveness and that it helped the creation of more effective schools. Additionally, more than three quarters of principals suggested that tenure had some impact on their decision-making and long-range planning, but no effect on commitment to their district, or on avoiding decisions that might affect their employment. No significant differences due to tenure status were found in these perceptions. Furthermore, no significant differences due to principal gender, wealth of the school, school enrollment, years as principal, and years in the current position were found in the perceptions about the necessity of a tenure system. Implications of these findings, limitations of the study, and future directions for this line of research are also discussed.

© Copyright by Raymond G. Cooper, 2008

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the faculty and staff of Seton Hall University for their instruction and guidance on my journey to completion of this degree. I would especially like to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Mary F. Ruzicka, my mentor, Dr. James M. Caulfield, Dr. Lois R. Favre, and Dr. Paul R. Semendinger for their unwavering assistance and support. All of you have contributed in numerous ways to the realization of my dream, and I am truly grateful.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my wife, Angela. Her love, support and belief in me over these many years has made the successful completion of this journey possible. I have learned the real meaning of love and the true value of friendship and I will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	x
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	8
Significance of the Study	8
Research Questions.....	9
Definitions	9
Limitations	11
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
The High School Principal.....	12
Principal Leadership	14
Effective Schools	16
Effective Schools and Leadership.....	17
Effective Schools and the Principalship	18
Principal Tenure.....	19
Principal Tenure and Effectiveness	21
Conclusion	23
III. METHODOLOGY	25
Participants	25
Measure	27
Procedure	31
Data Analysis	31
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	33
Introduction.....	33
Response Rate.....	33
Demographic Variables	34
Findings on the Research Questions.....	36
Research Question 1	36

Research Question 2	37
Research Question 3	40
Research Question 4	43
Research Question 5	44
Wealth of a School District.....	45
School Size	48
Years as Principal	49
Years in Current Position.....	50
Summary	52
 V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, & RECOMMENDATIONS	53
Research Question 1	53
Research Question 2	54
Research Question 3	56
Research Question 4	57
Research Question 5	59
Final Conclusions.....	60
Recommendations for Policy Making	62
Recommendations for Further Research.....	63
Summary	64
 References	66
 Appendix A: Survey Cover Letter	79
Appendix B: Need to Resource Capacity Breakdown (2005)	81
Appendix C: N/RC List by Group & County	83
Appendix D: County Breakdown of N/RC for Selected Sample	86
Appendix E: Survey Questionnaire	88
Appendix F: Collated Data Survey Questions 1, 2, & 4	93
Appendix G: Frequency Responses Survey Question 9	95
Appendix H: Collated Data Survey Question 9	97
Appendix I: Raw Data Survey Question 9	99
Appendix J: Collated Data Survey Question 10	102
Appendix K: ASSET Survey System	105

Appendix L: Summary Coding Questionnaire	111
Appendix M: Summary Coding Questionnaire Q 1-8, & 11-20	115
Appendix N: Summary Chi-square Analysis	121

List of Tables

Table 1. Stratified Sample Schools by County and Need to Resource Capacity.....	27
Table 2. Research Questions & Corresponding Survey Items.....	29
Table 3. Years as Principal & Current Position	34
Table 4. Tenure Status by Gender.....	35
Table 5. School Enrollment	35
Table 6. Need to Resource Capacity	36
Table 7. Necessity of Tenure	37
Table 8. Predominant Characteristics of Effective Schools	38
Table 9. Role of Tenure in the Creation of Effective Schools.....	39
Table 10. Perceptions of Effectiveness with Regard to Tenure Status.....	40
Table 11. Impact of Tenure on Decision-making by Tenure Status.....	41
Table 12. Impact of Tenure on Long-range Planning by Tenure Status.....	41
Table 13. Perceived Relationship between Tenure & Commitment by Tenure Status	42
Table 14. Tenure Status & Avoidance of Difficult Decisions.....	43
Table 15. Personal Beliefs about Current System of Tenure.....	44
Table 16. Need/Resource Capacity & Necessity of Tenure	45
Table 17. Need/Resource Capacity & Effectiveness & Tenure Status.....	46
Table 18. Necessity of Tenure by Gender	46
Table 19. Perceptions of Effectiveness & Tenure by Gender.....	47
Table 20. Perceived Relationship of Tenure & Commitment by Gender.....	48
Table 21. School Size & Tenure Necessity	49
Table 22. Number of Years as Principal & Tenure Necessity.....	50

Table 23. Number of Years Current Position & Tenure Necessity	51
---	----

Chapter I

Introduction

Well over two decades ago, American public education received a report card on its progress that was published in a report known as *A Nation at Risk*. The report portrayed a negative perception of American education that initiated 25 years of studies, innovations, and change movements seeking to alter the purported dismal course of education. The report offered several recommendations in the areas of content, standards and expectations, time, teaching, leadership, and fiscal support. Specifically in the area of leadership and supervision, it stated, “We recommend that citizens across the Nation hold educators and elected officials responsible for providing the leadership necessary to achieve these reforms” and later emphasized, “Principals and superintendents must play a crucial leadership role in developing school and community support for the reforms we propose” (A Nation at Risk, 1983, p. 5).

Three presidents, George H. W. Bush, William Jefferson Clinton, and George W. Bush have responded to America’s educational ills in the form of educational plans, namely America 2000, Goals 2000, and No Child Left Behind. Beneath federal initiatives were countless state and local initiatives as well; each reform plan offered guidance, proposed initiatives, and established accountability standards by which to measure progress and achievement of federal goals (Normore, 2006).

The New York State Board of Regents (1999) has acknowledged, “Today’s school environments have become more complex and diverse where all children are expected to learn” and further noted, “The increasing diversity of school communities places a premium on school leaders who can create a vision of success for all students”

(p. 2). The discussion of reform often involves a discussion of leadership and accountability (Darling-Hammond, 2004). This leads to a discussion about the leadership of the building principal. The high school principal is responsible for commencement level outcomes and graduation. In New York State, success on commencement level assessments, attendance rates, drop-out rates, and graduation rates are the standards by which districts are measured, held accountable, and deemed successful (NYSED, 2007a).

Researchers agree principals play a key role in school reform (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). A review of the literature found, "Principal[s] set a school's climate, affecting decision-making, communications, educational innovations, and teacher morale, while performing formal tasks regarding curriculum, people and staff performance, physical facilities, school community relations, and administration" (Geering, 1980, p. 1). The belief in the principal's influence on student achievement dates back to research in the 1970s and early 1980s (Marzano, 2003). Concentrating on effective schools, these studies found principals who were strong instructional leaders to be one of the positive correlates to improved school performance. A more recent study suggested that particular actions by principals such as developing teamwork, involving stakeholders in decision-making, serving as instructional resources, and fostering a climate of trust may directly influence student achievement (O'Donnell & White, 2005). Further, Fullan (2002) wrote, "For leaders to be able to deal with complex problems, they need at least 10 years of cumulative development on the job" (p. 12). Additionally, school success is often created by principals who take risks and seize opportunities (Teske & Schneider, 1999).

Accountability becomes intertwined in discussions of reform. Increasing standards and expectations make the principal's job more challenging and likely are worsening current administrator availability (Kaplan, Owings & Nunnery, 2005). The accountability movement has produced significant changes in administrative tenure policies with states reviewing education and tenure issues (Buckner, 2000). Concerns about the availability of effective administrators have led to the formation of various commissions on school leadership, including the New York based Blue Ribbon Commission on School Leadership, formed in 1998. This commission, appointed by the commissioner of education, was charged with the task of identifying essential characteristics of effective leaders (Duncan-Poitier, 2003). The commission's preamble acknowledges the challenges of reform, accountability, and leadership and states, "The Regents have made school leadership a public issue... New York's approach to accountability puts a premium on leadership... The annual school report cards and frequent publication of test scores puts public pressure on schools to improve" (Mills, 2000, p. 6).

The reform movement finds no shortage of research on the characteristics of effective schools (Newmann, King, & Youngs, 2000; Sammons, 1995; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000; Zigarelli, 1996), the qualities of effective building principals (Levine & Lezotte, 1995; Marzano, Walters & McNulty, 2005), or the fact that effective schools are led by effective principals (Blasé & Kirby 2000; Cotton, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Southworth, 2002; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000).

The literature suggests that principals are difficult to recruit, obtain, and more difficult still, retain (Hargraves & Dean, 2003). In fact, a recent study by the Educational

Testing Service indicated a shortage in qualified candidates in secondary schools (Chaika, 1998; Goodwin, Cunningham, & Childress, 2003). In a legal memorandum from National Association of Secondary School Principals, Kermit Buckner wrote, “The inadequate number of qualified applicants for principal positions is a national problem that requires addressing” (Buckner, 2000, p. 1). A report from the North Central Regional Education Laboratory declared that “a shrinking pool of candidates is stepping up to accept the ever-increasing demands and expectations of school leaders, and school communities across the country are facing the challenge of what is to come” (Mitgang, 2002, p. 1).

National media attention has been drawn to the anecdotal reporting of administrative shortages (Goodwin et al., 2003). Goodwin et al, proposed that, “it seems logical to infer that the shortage is an unintended consequence of [accountability] changes in the principalship” (p. 26). Whether one believes the reporting of shortages to be accurate, the possibility is “that at the very least some schools will be left without the high quality leaders they will need to meet the increasing demands for accountability with respect to improving student achievement” (Lankford, O’Connell, & Wycoff, 2003, p. 7).

The shortage of administrators, specifically public high school principals, is of curious interest (Fenwick & Pierce, 2000; Whitaker, 2001; Winter & Morgenthal, 2002). Compounding this curiosity is the movement to remove tenure for principals. Presently in the United States,

Nearly 80,000 public elementary and high school principals oversee the work of

some 3 million teachers and 52 million students... Aware that testing and licensing new principals by itself will not ensure the success of our schools, many states are also eliminating established principals' tenure (Chaika, 1998, p. 1).

According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), "As of March 1998, in about 16 states principals receive tenure or equivalent rights to a continuing contract and cannot be removed except for legally recognized reasons spelled out in state laws or regulations" (Chaika, 1998, p. 2). Thus, if principals who are strong instructional leaders are an essential part of school effectiveness, and time on task is important in the administration of successful schools, and change may necessitate risk-taking, then the topic of tenure appears to be related to principal effectiveness and requires further investigative commentary.

Accountability, reform and tenure often reside in the same discussion. According to critics of administrative tenure in education, one of the major contributors to the system's ineffectiveness is the tenure process for principals. These critics believe that accountability and academic achievement might well rise if tenure were eliminated (Leithwood & Earl, 2000).

All facets of education have come to center stage, been adopted by the media as newsworthy and made themselves the topic of political fodder. The discussion of tenure is no exception, is a source of heated debate, and refers to the state law due process rights granted to principals in New York State, pursuant to Section 3020-a of the New York State Education Law:

Tenure: (b) Principals, administrators, supervisors and all other members of the supervising staff of school districts, including common school districts and/or

school districts employing fewer than eight teachers, other than city school districts, shall be appointed by the board of education, or the trustees of a common school district, upon the recommendation of the superintendent of schools for a probationary period of three years. The service of a person appointed to any of such positions may be discontinued at any time during the probationary period on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, by a majority vote of the board of education or the trustees of a common school district (NYS Consolidated Law, Education, Tenure, Title 4 Article 61 § 3012 (1947)).

Many have argued that tenure is an outdated concept (Hutcheson, 1996). If American education is to remain competitive, districts need the flexibility to adjust faculty and administration staffing as educational needs change. Boards often view tenure as an obstruction to dismissal rather than protective due process (Hutcheson, 1996). In the most recent decade, several states have removed or altered principal tenure: Georgia, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Oregon, and part of Wisconsin are among those states that have altered tenure laws. As recently as May 2000, Alabama enacted laws that would offer increased pay to teachers and end tenure for principals (Robelen, 2000). At the same time, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Illinois, Colorado, and New York are among those states that have or are currently reviewing removal of principal tenure.

Education has become a political hot potato as media outlets splash banners across their papers calling for reform and accountability. Former New York State Governor George Pataki advanced proposals to end principal tenure in each of his annual State of the State addresses in Albany, New York. The Governor has stated, "...high

standards extend beyond the classroom of our schools and into the principals office” (Pataki, 1999, p. 1), and that is apparently his reason for wanting an end to tenure immediately. One plan under discussion during Pataki’s administration would have ended tenure for principals, which Pataki described as “a decades-old system that assured a principal a job for the length of his or her career by requiring cumbersome and time-consuming hearings for removal for incompetence and other grounds” (p. 2).

The Governor of New York State at this writing, Eliot Spitzer, has picked up his political predecessor’s call and stated his intent to abolish tenure albeit using a new tact: accountability. In his first address to the state on the matter, Governor Spitzer expressed his belief that accountability should include school leaders and called for “School Leadership Report Cards” to facilitate accountability efforts (Spitzer, 2007, p. 1).

In New York State, the Commissioner’s Blue Ribbon Panel explained, “The problem is three-fold: a shortage of people able to lead; a shortage of people willing to lead; and a shortage of people willing to work in the current environment which is often hostile toward leaders” (Mills, 2000, p. 2). Kersten and Kersten (2006) cited the Bureau of Labor Statistics: “The good news is that the current market for school administrators is one of the most promising in the past 30 years and is likely to remain so for the foreseeable future. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS, 2005) projected, “job openings in educational administration will be more numerous compared to all other jobs through 2014” (p. 2). All of this takes place at a time when the largest city school system in New York, New York City, has eliminated tenure. As the abolition of tenure has gained a foothold in New York City, the rest of the state watches carefully as Governor Spitzer initiates his call for the abolition of tenure for principals through accountability.

A study by Semendinger (2000) in the state of New Jersey assessed perceptions of the importance of tenure on principal effectiveness. His results indicated that the majority of the respondents felt that tenure was an important job protection. He further observed that a majority of the participating principals reported a belief that tenure allowed them to make educationally sound decisions without fear of political repercussions (Semendinger, 2000). Semendinger's final recommendations included the suggestion to replicate his study with other demographic variables. This research, then, aims to follow this recommendation by replicating Semendinger's study with public high school principals in the state of New York. It is particularly important to assess principals' perceptions on the topic in this location because of policymakers' increasing scrutiny of principal tenure. Further, by replicating the study in a different geographic location, the body of research will become increasingly useful in making generalizations to the larger population.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to replicate the Semendinger study in New York State to (a) determine the attitudes of current active public high school principals as they relate to tenure and principal effectiveness, (b) to determine if there is a difference between the attitudes of tenured and nontenured principals as they relate to tenured principal effectiveness, and (c) to determine if tenure status plays a role in current principals' decision-making process.

Significance of the Study

The removal of tenure for New York State principals is a growing possibility, as evidenced by both repeated calls for such from state legislators of New York and the removal of tenure for New York City principals. In keeping with the state's mandate for

shared decision-making, the decision to remove tenure in New York State deserves input and research from the field of administration. This study endeavors to bridge the gaps that exist in the body of knowledge currently available to legislators, educators, and practitioners who may be called upon to make recommendations regarding tenure in New York State.

Research Questions

In replicating Semendinger's study, this research will focus on the same five questions:

1. What are the attitudes of public high school principals in New York with regard to tenure?
2. According to public high school principals in New York, what is the impact of principal tenure on the creation of effective schools?
3. Do public high school principals in New York find that their own tenure status plays a significant role in their decision-making process?
4. Are public high school principals in New York in favor of repealing tenure for their position?
5. Do demographic variables such as wealth of a school district, gender, school size, or years as principal play a significant role in the views of public high school principals in New York as they relate to tenure?

Definitions

Big Five Schools: New York City, Buffalo, Yonkers, Syracuse, and Rochester

Board of Regents or Regents: Established by the New York State Legislature on May 1, 1784, the Regents of The University of the State of New York form the oldest,

continuous state education entity in America (New York State Education Department, 2007b).

Effective principal: Any individual in a supervisory role tasked with the responsibility of building administrator or principal, who has been objectively judged to have met the educational needs of students under their charge.

Effective school: Also known as a “Successful School,” any school that has been adjudicated through an objective assessment and reported as having satisfied the stated educational goals or mission of the school, the state, or higher educational authority.

High school: A school between elementary school and college, usually offering general, technical, vocational, or college-preparatory courses.

Need to Resource Capacity (N/RC): The New York State Education Department defines this as an “amalgam of demographic data for the school district combines the best indicator of educational need (school district student poverty) with the financial resources of the school district, district enrollment and district land area, to place districts into six distinctly different categories” (New York State Education Department, 2005, Appendix B).

Principal: A person who has controlling authority or is in a leading position; the building administrator tasked with the overall responsibility of a building whose tasks may include but are not limited to budget, scheduling, recruiting, interviewing, observing, or evaluating faculty and staff, the design and vision of educational priorities, and the overall climate and culture of the educational institution.

Public school: A free tax-supported school controlled by a local governmental authority.

Similar schools: A grouping used by the New York State Education Department on the New York State School Report Card to compare schools according to three factors: 1) Grade Range of Students Served by the School, 2) School District Capabilities, and 3) Needs of the Student Population. Grade organization in schools normally refers to the student population age range in schools (New York State Education Department, 2005).

Tenure: The act, right, manner, or term of holding something (as a position, or an office); a status granted after a trial period to an administrator that gives protection from summary dismissal.

Limitations

Limitations of this study perceived or implied should not affect its outcome. The population surveyed included principals of public high (secondary) schools in the State of New York and does not include representation from the Big Five Schools. The survey is therefore limited to New York State; the findings may not generalize to other states. The schools surveyed include representation from all of the remaining N/RC groups identified by New York State (see Appendix B). The data were collected over a period of 4 weeks. A longitudinal study could reveal different results. The survey data received represent principals with various years of experience in administration and in the current position and includes both males and females that are tenured and nontenured. The data received includes principal perceptions that have been articulated through an online survey. The responses were recorded as received from the participants without a guarantee of candor or accuracy from the respondent. Any single rater bias perceived or implied may be influenced by the key components of the replicated research.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of current public high school principals with regard to tenure and principal effectiveness, to see if there is a difference in attitudes between tenured and nontenured principals, and finally, to see if tenure plays a role in principals' decision-making. It is appropriate, then, to reach a common working definition of the variables presented in this body of research and review the relevant research associated with those variables.

The High School Principal

A focus of this study, the high school principal, is the individual most readily identified with the day-to-day management and supervision of the high school. Principals have been viewed by some as managers and supervisors, inundated with duties and tasks that run the gamut as "psychologist, teacher, facilities manager, philosopher, police officer, diplomat, social worker, mentor, PR director, coach, and cheerleader" (Trial, 2000, p. 4). The needs of the educational system also require principals to both manage and lead. In their daily work, principals must be "bifocal," managing the basic routines of the school and leading it forward through their vision and values (Deal & Peterson, 1994). Others disagree stating, "School management and instructional leadership are two separate tasks that cannot be performed by a single individual" (Highsmith & Rallis, 1986, p. 300). The demands of time combined with the diverse needs of management and leadership are too great to be accomplished by one individual according to Highsmith and Rallis. The position of principal is a recurring and constant characteristic of public high schools. Traditional views of school governance place the principal as the leader of the

educational hierarchy. Either way, the principals' role is unique in that it deals with varied constituents in multiple arenas and interest groups and yet remains ultimately accountable for the educational outcomes of the building. While there are variations to the leadership model (i.e., co-principals, or collective leadership roles) efforts to establish educational structures without a principal are viewed as experimental and are rarely found in mainstream education (Gurr, Drysdale & Mulford, 2006). While there is limited disagreement countering the belief that principals have an impact on the lives of teachers and students, "both the nature and degree of this effect continues to be open to debate" (p. 5), according to Hallinger and Heck (1996).

In the past several decades, there have been numerous reform movements to improve education. The traditional role of principal has been reexamined and there has been a decentralization of traditional authority (Bezzina, 2006). This change in the traditional role was characterized by Normore (2004) who observed, "The principal's role has undergone a re-conceptualization ... from being the authority figure at the top of the school pyramid, the principal must become the facilitator at the center of a complex web of partners" (p. 61). In New York State, O'Connell et al., (2005) observed the principals' roles, responsibilities and accountability have changed, and stated that "over the last five years, the conversation has become more highly focused on New York State standards and assessments in core subject areas, and on all students' academic achievement, which is both quantifiable and able to be compared across classrooms, buildings, regions, and, indeed, the state" (p. 33). The importance of the principal in facilitating positive change can be found in studies that detail positional power and authority (McLaughlin & Hyle, 2001; Stiegelbauer, 1984). The Educational Research Service (ERS, 2000) wrote, "The

[Principalship is] a position that is absolutely critical to educational change and improvement” (p. 1). Effective and deliberate leadership is generally accepted as a central component in implementing and sustaining school improvement (Bezzina, 2006). Zepeda (2004) noted that principals’ efforts were “critical in creating the conditions necessary to build a learning community” (p. 150). There is an important and noteworthy limitation to the current research regarding principal leadership; the research typically relied on administrators as the source of information (Gurr et al., 2006).

While their responsibilities and duties have evolved over the years, “Educational leaders and policy makers agree that the principal plays a key role in creating high performing schools” (ERS, 2000, p. 1). In 2000, a Blue Ribbon Panel, chaired by New York State Education Commissioner Mills, issued a statement on school leadership. The Panel, while politically appointed, emphasized the vital role of [principal] leadership in achieving success with the State’s strategy to reform its education system to meet higher learning standards.

Principal Leadership

Leadership is thought to be important to the innovation of our schools. It is also acknowledged that schools matter when addressing student learning and a great deal is known about, “the organizational structures, leadership roles, and conditions of schools that contribute to innovation” (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004, p. 3). Principals’ leadership is important in promoting successful schools. However, as Spillane et al. (2004) pointed out, “While it is generally acknowledged that where there are good schools there are good leaders, it has been difficult to construct an account of school leadership grounded in everyday practice” (p. 4). During the past 2—3 decades, various

educational reform efforts have held influence over the role that principals should play as school leaders. Several schools of leadership have emerged with titles such as instructional, participative, democratic, and transformational (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004).

Leadership, both straightforward and intricate, remains the responsibility of the principal, whether the style includes a participatory form or a more directive form and includes two essential elements: “helping the organization set a defensible set of directions and influencing members to move in those directions” (Leithwood et al., 2004, p. 4). DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran (2003) defined instructional leadership, “as a term that described a broad set of principal roles and responsibilities designed to address the workplace needs of successful teachers and to foster improved achievement among students” (p. 44).

In nearly all cases, the literature dating back to the 1970s reflects a belief that the principal’s influence impacts student achievement in an effective school (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Goodwin et al., 2003). In fact, “thirty years of research have established clear-cut statistical correlations between principal leadership and student achievement” (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007, p. 220). Although there is evidence correlating principal leadership and student achievement, the identification of a causal relationship between the two variables has yet to be confirmed (Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). Concentrating on effective schools, the literature indicated strong instructional leadership as one of the key correlates to school performance.

Effective Schools

The Effective Schools movement began in the 1960s as a response to the publication of the Coleman Report in “The Equal Educational Opportunity Survey” in 1966. The report concluded that family background, not the school, was the major determinant of student achievement. This report, along with research of the time, was the catalyst for the creation of compensatory education. The findings purported that schools did not make a difference in predicting student achievement, launching a decade of intense research to prove otherwise. The Effective Schools movement began as an effort to identify schools in which students achieved from those in which students failed to achieve. The backlash saw investigations into effective instruction (Rosenshine, 1983) and effective schools (Edmonds, 1979). These studies sought to prove that socioeconomic status and family background neither caused nor precluded instructional effectiveness. Effective schools as a counter effort and the research it spawned substantiated that schools do make a difference and may have a profound impact on student achievement (Edmonds, 1979; Karweit, 1976; Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983).

Lezotte’s (1991a) research summarized the research of the time by reporting the effective school as having several specific and unique traits or characteristics that include: a clear school mission, high expectations for success, instructional leadership, frequent monitoring of student progress, opportunity to learn and student time on task, a safe and orderly environment, and positive home-school relations. Collectively, these traits are known as the correlates of effective schools and are found repeatedly throughout the literature on effective schools (Brandt, 1982; Lezotte, 1991a). Of these traits, instructional leadership is identified as the primary task of the principal (Lezotte,

1991a, p. 3). An effective principal is usually the directing leader of an effective school. Specifically, the “principal becomes the ‘leader of leaders’ in an effective school rather than a leader of followers” (Lezotte, 1991a, p. 3).

Staffs with effective principals exhibit a sense of teamwork and inclusiveness in planning, enabling, and assessing instruction. High-performing schools that demonstrate better student achievement possess a climate that focuses on student learning, all supervised by the principal (O’Donnell & White, 2005).

Effective Schools and Leadership

Effective leadership is, or should be, the goal of every organization. Not only must principals plan and achieving a compelling vision for their schools. Kaplan et al. reported, “Many of the most impressive examples of school wide change and student achievement gains involve a talented principal who has brought together teachers, parents, and students...to improve teaching and learning” (Kaplan et al., 2005, p. 28).

New York State concurs that effective school leadership is vital to student success. Their concern is such that they commissioned a study titled, *Our Next Generation, School Leadership in New York State*. The purpose of this study was to identify “How New York will find, prepare, certify, and keep current a sufficient number of leaders of character, skill, and diversity to enable all children to reach the standards” (Lankford et al., 2003, p. v). Privately funded in cooperation with the University of the State of New York, the report concluded, “Effective leadership is at the core of every successful organization... and effective leaders collaboratively create a vision and establish a climate for people to reach their highest level of achievement” (Lankford et al., 2003, p. 3).

Quality leadership means sharing authority and responsibility, establishing a culture that supports high achievement, and continuously using information about student performance to guide improvements and hold individuals and groups accountable for their work. Effective principals, who are also good instructional leaders can often be seen, “systematically visiting classrooms, frequently interacting with students, publicly celebrating accomplishments of students, and maintain visibility around the school” (Gentillucci & Muto, 2007, p. 220). In a landmark meta-analysis of 30 years of research on the relationship between leadership and student achievement, Walters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003) reported that the effects of principals’ practices on student achievement found a significant, positive correlation between effective school leadership and student achievement.

Effective Schools and the Principalship

Principals are central to school improvement (Deal & Peterson, 1998), restructuring (Newman, King, & Youngs, 2000), and school effectiveness (Levine & Lezotte, 1995). They help promote change, lead reforms, and support good teaching. In a review of school-reform literature, Grubbs, Leech, Gibbs, & Green (2002) found that “the school principal is the key player in all successful reforms” (p. 3). Grubbs et al. concluded, “The effective-schools movement recognized the importance of quality leadership by consistently identifying strong instructional leadership as instrumental in creating a school climate conducive to student success” (p. 3).

Kelley, Thornton, and Daugherty (2005) reported “education leadership” as possibly the most important single determinant of an effective learning environment. Principals of effective schools demonstrate essential elements for achieving success that

include high expectations, clear vision, and leadership (National Association for Schools of Excellence, 1999). Strong instructional leadership in the effective school is characterized by a principal who acts as instructional leader and effectively and consistently communicates the mission to staff, parents, and students. The relationship between effective schools and the principalship is further evidenced by the agreement among education policy makers that “the principal plays a key role in creating the high-performing schools that the public demands today” (ERS, 2000, p. 1).

Principal Tenure

Before discussing principal tenure in New York State, a definition of tenure and familiarity with its evolution is appropriate.

Tenure in New York State began in the early 1900s. In 1917, New York’s first public school tenure law was enacted and directly affected the teachers of New York City. Teachers in other districts throughout the state continued to be employed by contract and were occasionally subjected to arbitrary dismissal. Local school boards were the sole governing body in determining a teacher’s length of service. Teachers throughout the state were subjected to the whims of the local boards of education and, at times, were randomly dismissed because of differing political agendas or for holding contrary opinions. In 1937, the New York State Education Law section 3012 on tenure was expanded to cover Union Free School Districts, and thus expanding tenure protection to the rest of the state. New York State law on tenure was expanded to include several due process rights in 1945. The 1970s saw a change in the tenure review process by replacing partisan school board hearing panels with independent panels selected by the district and the teacher. In 1972, Chapter 953 was enacted, which: (1) permitted boards

of education to enter contracts of up to 5 years with principals, supervisors, and all other supervisory staff; and (2) clarified that the 1971 change to eliminate administrator tenure only applied to those who did not have tenure at the time the law was enacted and were not serving a probationary period (i.e., the law was not retroactive) (SANNYS, 2005).

In 1975, tenure was reinstated with amendments that reduced the pre-tenure probationary period from 5 to 3 years. Tenure laws of the time stated,

Principals, administrators, supervisors, and all other members of the supervising staff of school districts... shall be appointed by the Board of Education, with the trustees of a common school district, upon the recommendation of the superintendent of schools for a probationary period of three years (New York State Consolidated Law, Education, Tenure, Title 4 Article 61 § 3012, 1947).

The tenure process gives administrators a guaranteed right to a formal legal procedure if allegations of wrongdoing are filed against them. Tenure, once granted, becomes a guaranteed system of due process, not a guarantee of lifetime employment. Generally speaking, a New York State administrator has a probation period of approximately 3 years. During that period, administrators may be dismissed for any reason including, but not limited to, those found under Just Cause. Prior to the end of that 3-year probationary period and upon recommendation of the superintendent of schools, the local school board must either grant or deny tenure. Once tenured, an administrator may only be dismissed for Just Cause, a group of generalized reasons recognized by New York State as grounds for dismissal. These include insubordination, conduct unbecoming a teacher, inefficiency, incompetence, physical or mental disability, neglect of duty, failure to maintain certification, and an immoral character. The due

process guaranteed by tenure against a teacher is known as a 3020-a hearing. The 3020-a hearing is a time sensitive-process that includes a period of discovery, review, defense, and adjudication.

Principal Tenure and Effectiveness

The potential relationship between principal tenure and effectiveness is an important facet of this research. How a principal executes his or her duties may be influenced by his or her own values and beliefs, as well as key organizational and political variables (Glasman & Heck, 1992). One such variable influencing a principal's effectiveness may be his or her tenure status. However, many studies tend to equate tenure status with years of experience or years in current position. Few studies, if any, examine principal tenure status as a variable in its own right.

For example, in a survey of over 1400 middle school principals, Bauck (1987) found that increased years of experience in the present position was related to effectiveness in middle school principals and concluded that it appears that tenure may be related to effectiveness. Bauck also reported that these findings are similar to findings on effective elementary and high school principals. Similarly, in their investigation into the importance of leadership in school principals, Teske & Schneider (1999) reported succinctly, "Experience matters... [effective] principals had considerable time in the system and drew on this knowledge base to identify strategies that gave them the policy-space to pursue their goals" (p. 23). They purported that this time "allowed them to learn, first hand, what worked, and what rules could be ignored and what rules could not be ignored" (p. 22). They further explained that "implementing a vision is not instantaneous; it requires repeated cycles of reflection, evaluation, and response" (p. 10).

Together, these studies (Bauck, 1987; Teske & Schneider, 1999) point us in the direction that tenure may be related to effectiveness. By its very nature, tenure provides principals with more years in their position. However, Bauck (1987) cautioned readers that a given number of years in a position do not necessarily suggest that a principal has become effective. In fact, many might argue that the topic of tenure is more complex than time in the position and that the two concepts are not perfectly correlated. For example, Tang and Chamberlain (2003) found that length of service had a significant effect on faculty behaviors, whereas rank and tenure did not. Thus, while length of service and tenure are similar, they may not be synonymous.

Few studies have found that tenure status is related to key aspects of effectiveness, including decision-making, commitment to one's school district, and long-range planning. Piazza (1996) explored principal's perceptions of decision-making related to tenure. His research concluded male principals made difficult decisions with less discomfort than female principals, and while tenure had an effect, it was not significant. Nir and Zilberstein-Levy (2006) found that nontenured members in higher education had a tendency to make safe decisions. There remains a conspicuous absence of available research regarding tenure and commitment or tenure and long-range planning. Thus, it appears that Semendinger's (2000) research on secondary school principals in New Jersey is significant and exclusive in this area, being one of the first to examine the specific role of tenure status in all of the identified areas of principal effectiveness proposed here. It appeared that many of Semendinger's respondents agreed that tenure was more complex than simply time on the job. In fact, well over 85% of those surveyed in his study reported a belief that tenure is an important job protection. Further, over 60%

of all the respondents reported believing that principal tenure directly impacts on a school's effectiveness.

Conclusion

There have been several methodological problems as well as conceptual problems that have hindered further clarification of the linkage between principal tenure and effectiveness, beyond that of those studies described above. First, much of the research on the relationship between principal tenure and effectiveness (and on tenure in general) has focused largely on samples of university faculty. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether such findings generalize to secondary school settings.

Additionally, as Gentilucci and Muto (2007) point out, over the last 30 years, much research in this area utilized data collected from administrators, school board members, classroom teachers, and even students. As an example, Czerwonka (2005) pointed out that most evaluations of leadership effectiveness are measured by subjective perceptions of the leader's effectiveness by subordinates or supervisors through questionnaires or interviews. Such studies often contain qualitative data only, meaning that they are only descriptive of the sample they collected from, and few if any inferences can be made about the general population.

Many of the samples found in the available research were either too small or too homogeneous to generalize results. A typical example was found in Goodwin et al. (2003), in which the subjects included NASSP Principals of the Year who volunteered to participate. Finally, the definition of effectiveness varies across studies, often lacking a clear operational definition from which to work.

The relationship between principal tenure status and effectiveness is complex, as each principal operates with the context of a school, and each school exists within a larger community. Indeed, many contextual variables (e.g., wealth of school district, school enrollment, gender of the school principal) may moderate principal behavior (Glasman & Heck, 1992) in ways that may impact their effectiveness. However, studies on principal effectiveness often fail to address these and other relevant factors, making it impossible to draw causal links. There appears to be an absence of published research detailing any relationship between tenure and effectiveness from the principal's perspective, with the notable exception of Semendinger's (2000) work.

This body of research will expand on that exploration and contribute the attitudes and perspectives of public high school principals from New York State to the field of research.

Chapter III

Methodology

Participants

Participants ($N = 28$) were New York State high school principals. The principals of the Big Five are not represented in this study. Principals represented various years of experience both in their position as principal and as principal of their current school. Of the 28 participants, 71.43% were male. The selection process sought to mirror Semendinger's (2000) principal sample with one exception: school classification system. School districts in New York State are assigned a district descriptor designation known as an N/RC Group. The New York State Department of Education developed the N/RC system so that schools throughout the state would be able to draw comparisons, regardless of school size or location. When comparing similar schools, three factors are taken into consideration: grade range of students served by the school, school district capabilities, and needs of the school student population. This demographic data allows New York State districts to be placed into six categories. Each of the six categories is acknowledged as containing a distinct type of school district that faces similar challenges and has the ability to draw upon comparable levels of resources. The N/RC groups are as follows: Group 1 includes all of the schools of New York City, Group 2 schools have a high N/RC and includes other large cities, Group 3 schools have a high N/RC and tend to be smaller urban or suburban schools, Group 4 schools have a high N/RC and tend to be rural schools, Group 5 schools have an average N/RC schools, and Group 6 schools have a low N/RC. In the continuum of services, N/RC Group 3 schools are poorer schools

requiring more educational aid and the N/RC Group 6 schools are the more affluent schools requiring less educational aid (NYSED, 2005).

Grade range, the grade level of students served, is an important measurement when addressing N/RC. The grade range of students served by each school is divided into three categories. Schools that contain grades K—4 are described as elementary schools. Schools that contain Grades 5 through 8 are described as middle schools. Schools that serve Grades 9 through 12 are considered secondary schools. This study considered principals of secondary (high) schools. According to a New York State school-wide state survey, there were approximately 499 high schools in this category (NYSED, 2005).

After an investigation of the 499 secondary schools in New York State, a sample was selected to statistically represent the N/RC distribution of public schools in the state. This selection required the tallying of the total number of districts represented by each N/RC category from the state. The next step was to calculate the percentage of schools represented by any one N/RC designation as it relates to the state's total population for each N/RC category.

Using data available from the New York State Education Department (NYSED, 2005), a sample of 50 schools from eight counties was taken from the identified population of 499 schools. This stratified sample most closely approximates the distribution of N/RC of New York State, minus the Big Five Schools. The anticipated response rate for this sample survey was 40%, considered a “good” survey response for an email survey (DIIA, 2007) Schools in the selected stratified sample are listed by county in Table 1. The survey average indicates the principals polled by N/RC category,

and the NYS average indicates the principals in the state average in the identified N/RC category.

Table 1

Stratified Sample Schools by County and Need to Resource Capacity

County	N/RC Group				Total <i>f</i>
	Group 3 <i>f</i> (%)	Group 4 <i>f</i> (%)	Group 5 <i>f</i> (%)	Group 6 <i>f</i> (%)	
Alleghany	0	3	0	0	3
Broome	2	1	7	0	10
Herkimer	0	4	1	0	5
Onondaga	0	0	5	2	7
Putnam	0	0	3	2	5
Rockland	1	0	2	3	6
Schenectady	1	0	3	1	5
Westchester	1	0	5	3	9
Principals polled	5 (10.0%)	8 (16.0%)	26 (52.0%)	11 (22.0%)	50
NYS principals by N/RC	9.2%	16.0%	52.3%	22.4%	499

Measure

Survey items were developed, tested, and utilized by Semendinger (2000) in his doctoral research. The survey consisted of 16 questions for each participant. In Part I, the first seven items were demographic in nature, collecting independent variables related to the participant, such as tenure status, gender, years as principal, and years in current position, as well as variables related to the schools they served, such as enrollment, grade levels, and N/RC group. For the N/RC group designation, a URL link

(<http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repocrd2005/#Map>) was provided within the survey to increase accessibility to this information. The next question asked if the participant believed tenure was necessary for public school principals. Part II focused on participants' attitudes about effective schools and tenure, specific to the participant's current tenure status. Dependent variables were measured in Question 11 regarding decision-making, Question 12 regarding long-range planning, Questions 13 and 17 regarding commitment, and Questions 15 and 19 regarding beliefs about effectiveness. Three items were open ended, requiring a short, written response. Responses to closed-ended questions were based upon Likert-type rating scales with three to four possible responses provided. The first research question refers specifically to the attitudes of the participants about the necessity of tenure and required only a single "yes-no" survey response in Survey Question 8. The remainder of the research questions utilized a combination of survey questions to gain information from the different tenure perspectives of the respondent. The five research questions and the corresponding survey questions are illustrated in Table 2.

Semendinger's pilot studies have established that this measure is reliable. He reported a reliability coefficient alpha of .7376, indicating that the measure was internally consistent, meaning, "the consistency with which all the items are measuring the same thing" (Semendinger, 2000, p. 40). The involvement of professional colleagues from Educational Administration and Supervision and colleagues from the K—12 educational profession in development of the survey provided strong evidence of construct and content validity with regard to the survey instrument. The procedure used in Semendinger's (2000) research is consistent with that prescribed in Lawshe's (1975)

and Patton's (2002) methods of establishing content validity, wherein professional evaluation and agreement by a panel of experts has been determined to yield content validity.

Table 2

Research Questions & Corresponding Survey Items

<u>Research question</u>	<u>corresponding survey item(s)</u>
1. What are the attitudes of public high school principals in New York with regard to tenure?	8. "Do you believe tenure is necessary for public school principals?"
2. According to public high school principals in New York, what is the impact of principal tenure on the creation of effective schools?	9. "What do you believe are the predominate characteristics of effective schools?" 10. "What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools?" 15. "How do you perceive your own effectiveness as a principal in regard to your tenure status?" 19. "What role do you believe tenure will play in your own effectiveness as principal?"
3. Do public high school principals in New York find that their own tenure status plays a significant role in the decision-making process?	11. "Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your decision-making." 12. "Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your long range planning." 13. "Since you have been granted tenure, how do you perceive your commitment to your district?" 17. "How do you believe your commitment to your district will change if you are awarded tenure?"

Table 2 (continued)

Research Questions & Corresponding Survey Items

Research question	corresponding survey item(s)
	14. "Before you were granted tenure, did you avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment?"
	18. "Since you currently do not have tenure, have you had to avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment?"
4. Are public high school principals in New York in favor of repealing tenure for their position?	16. & 20. "Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals."
5. "Do demographic variables such as wealth of a school district, gender, school size, grade levels supervised, or years as principal play a significant role in the views of public high school principals in New York as they relate to tenure?"	1. "Number of years as a principal?" 2. "Number of years in your current position?" 3. "Are you currently tenured in your position?" 4. "Current enrollment of your school?" 5. "Your District's "Need to Resource Capacity" group?" 6. "What grade levels does your school service?" 7. "Your sex." 8. "Do you believe tenure is necessary for public school principals?"

Procedure

While Semendinger's (2000) survey was mailed, research data in this instance was collected via an online-survey instrument, in order to take full advantage of the current advances in technology. It utilized the Academic Survey System and Evaluation Tool (ASSET), an online-survey tool developed by Dr. Bert Wachsmuth, Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science at Seton Hall University. The ASSET allows participants to respond to survey questions with a guarantee of anonymity and is secured on a server on the Seton Hall University campus.

A personally addressed cover e-mail containing a link to the online survey instrument was e-mailed by name to the principal of each of the 50 high schools. That e-mail introduced the Principal Tenure Survey and its rationale, verified the survey met the requirements of the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for implementation, and outlined the procedures and deadlines for completion of the survey. The principal addressed at each identified school was asked for their participation and advised that completion of the online survey indicated a willingness and permission to participate. An e-mail was sent at one-week intervals as a deadline reminder to each of the participants.

Data Analysis

Data were coded both by me for open-ended responses and automatically by the ASSET program for closed-ended responses (see Appendixes L & M) and then analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 15.0 software program. Data analysis was guided by the research work of Patton (2002) and included qualitative analysis along themes and patterns and quantitative analysis through

descriptive statistics. Qualitative analysis included a content analysis of the open-ended responses, seeking recurring text or theme patterns in the responses. Through this inductive analysis, key words, repetitive text and patterns emerged as a result of the open coding. The open-ended responses were categorized (based on key words, repetitive text, or patterns in the response) tallied, and their frequency reported. All responses were reported with key words, high frequency responses, and patterns noted (Patton, 2002). Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and frequencies of responses were used to make initial observations. The Pearson chi-square test for the purposes of this research were used as a test of independence to assess whether paired observations (yes-no responses) on two variables (tenure vs. nontenure), were independent of each other as well as to examine potential relationships between tenure status (tenured vs. not tenured) and attitudes about principal effectiveness.

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

Following the research methodology outlined in Chapter 3, personally addressed electronic surveys via ASSET were sent to 50 public high school principals from eight counties in New York State. The 50 schools identified for the survey most closely mirrored the overall proportionate state demographic distribution of secondary public schools. The combination of schools from these counties and their respective N/RC provided a representative sample of New York State's overall demographic breakdown (minus New York City and a group of city schools collectively known as the Big Five).

Response Rate

A total of 50 high school principals received personally addressed electronic surveys simultaneously. They were given 2 weeks to complete and return the survey. At the end of the two week deadline, 19 responses (38%) were received along with returned e-mail requests by several schools to extend the survey deadline due to administrator vacation conflicts. For this reason, the deadline was extended an additional 2 weeks. An additional nine responses were received during this extended time period, yielding a total response rate of 56%. Utilizing a survey formula designed at the University of Texas at Austin, an online Web-based response rate of 50% was determined to be "good" and response rate of 60% was determined to be "very good" (DIIA, 2007). The 56% response rate from this online survey was characterized as a "good" response rate (Babbie, 1999 as cited in Semendinger, 2000; DIIA, 2007).

Demographic Variables

Standard statistical measurements of frequency, percentages, means, and standard deviations are reported wherever appropriate for each of the demographic variables. As stated earlier, 28 participants completed the survey. Of these, 96.43% of participants provided their number of years as principal and all participants provided their number of years in their current position (see Table 3). The majority of participants reporting (77.78%) had 4—20 years of experience as a principal ($M = 10.54$, $SD = 6.44$). Only 7.1 % of participants reporting indicated that they had been a principal for at least 20 years. In comparison, half of all participants (50%) reported serving in their current position for 4 to 10 years ($M = 7.30$, $SD = 3.88$). Equally balanced in this study were those with up to 4 years in their position and those with 11 to 20 years in their position, both comprising 25% of the participants. No participants reported serving in their current position for more than 20 years.

Table 3

Years as Principal & Current Position

Years	As Principal		In current position	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
≤ 3	4	14.29%	7	25.0%
4-10	10	35.71%	14	50.0%
11-20	11	39.29%	7	25.0%
> 20	2	7.14%	0	0.0%
Subtotal	27	96.43%	28	100.0%
Missing	1	3.57%	0	0.0%
Total	28	100.0%	28	100.0%

The majority of participants (78.57%) reported having tenure at the time of the survey. The remaining 21.43% reported being untenured. Responses by gender are found in Table 4.

Table 4

Tenure Status by Gender

Gender	Tenured	Untenured	Total
	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	%
Male	16	4	71.43%
Female	6	2	28.57%
Total %	78.57%	21.43%	100.00%

With regard to enrollment of the participants' schools, the majority of participants were principals of large schools. In fact, 50% of participants reported enrollments greater than 800 students, as seen in Table 5. As the Need to Resource Capacity formula does not take into account school size (enrollment), there was no expectation or anticipation of school size for this measurement.

Table 5

School Enrollment

Number of students	<i>f</i>	%
< 400	1	3.6%
400-800	12	42.8%
> 800	14	50.0%
Subtotal	27	96.4%
Missing	1	3.6%
Total	28	100.0%

With regard to reported Need to Resource Capacity (N/RC) categories for participants' schools, 14.3% of the schools were smaller urban/suburban schools with a high N/RC. A total of 7.1% of respondents were rural schools with a high N/RC. Furthermore, 42.9% were average N/RC. Finally, 28.6% were low N/RC. Despite the availability of N/RC information via the URL link provided, the remaining 7.1% of participants did not report their school's N/RC code. Results are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Need to Resource Capacity

N/RC Group	<i>f</i>	%
3	4	14.3%
4	2	7.1%
5	12	42.9%
6	8	28.6%
Subtotal	26	92.9%
Missing	2	7.1%
Total	28	100.0%

Findings on the Research Questions

Research Question 1

What are the attitudes of public high school principals in New York with regard to tenure?

As presented in Table 7, a full 78.57% of respondents stated that tenure was necessary for public secondary school principals in New York State.

Table 7

Necessity of Tenure

	Tenure necessary <i>f</i> (%)	Tenure unnecessary <i>f</i> (%)	Total <i>f</i> (%)
Total	22 (78.57%)	6 (21.43%)	28 (100.0%)

It merits comment that 78.6% of those responding believed tenure was necessary, and 78.6% of those responding had tenure. A closer investigation of related response frequencies indicated that this pattern was coincidence. Further, a Pearson chi-square analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between tenure status and beliefs about the necessity of tenure $\chi^2 (1, N = 28) = 0.103, p > .05$.

Research Question 2

According to public high school principals in New York, what is the impact of principal tenure on the creation of effective schools?

Three items were utilized to gather information about participants' perceptions about the impact of principals' tenure on the creation of effective schools. First, participants were asked in Survey Question 9 to list what they believed to be the predominant characteristics of effective schools. Nearly all participants (96.43%) provided a range of short answers encompassing a variety of topics. Nominal data were categorized by key words and themes and then coded to allow frequency tallies (see Appendix G). I reported all responses with key words and high frequency responses following the format in Patton's *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (2002). The most frequently cited characteristics of effective schools were: high quality

professional staff (44.44%), an academic focus (40.74%), effective leadership (33.33%), safe-positive-nurturing environment (33.33%), and a student-centered or student-focused school (33.33%). Responses are presented in Table 8. A complete collection of raw data is found in Appendixes G, H, and I.

Table 8

Predominant Characteristics of Effective Schools

Characteristic of Effective School	<i>f</i>	%
High quality professional staff	12	44.44%
Academic focus	11	40.74%
Effective leadership	9	33.33%
Safe/positive/nurturing environment	9	33.33%
Student centered/focused	9	33.33%
Supportive parents/community	5	18.52%
Accountability	2	7.40%
Communication	2	7.40%
Goals	2	7.40%
Assessments	1	3.70%
Good discipline/positive behavior	1	3.70%
Professional development	1	3.70%
Shared vision/decision-making	1	3.70%
Technology	1	3.70%

Second, participants were asked in Survey Question 10 to consider the potential role of tenure in the creation of effective schools. Again, nominal data were categorized by key words and themes and then coded to allow frequency tallies (see Appendix J). Of those who responded to this item, 74.07% indicated a general belief that tenure does in fact play a role in the creation of effective schools. The majority of participants (92.86%) elaborated on their response, identifying specific mechanisms through which they perceived tenure to impact principal effectiveness. The most frequent response was the feeling that, with tenure, principals can lead without the pressure of outside political influence. This was followed by themes such as decision-making without fear, leading with a sense of confidence, and leading with the ability to take risks. Table 9 presents the frequencies of these responses. A complete list of responses is included in Appendix I and outlines the miscellaneous responses to this question.

Table 9

Role of Tenure in the Creation of Effective Schools

Key words	<i>f</i>	%
Leading without political influence	7	25.00%
Leading without fear	3	10.71%
Leading with confidence	3	10.71%
Allowing risk taking	2	7.14%
Miscellaneous responses	11	39.29%
No response	2	7.14%

Third, participants were asked in Survey Questions 15 and 19 to report their perceptions of their own effectiveness with regard to tenure status. This item was worded for tenured and nontenured participants accordingly. Responses to both versions of this

item are combined and presented in Table 10. More than half of the participants (60.71%) perceived that they were, or would be, more effective in their position with tenure.

Table 10

Perceptions of Effectiveness with Regard to Tenure Status

Effectiveness as principal	<i>f</i>	(%)
More effective	17	(60.71%)
No impact on effectiveness	11	(39.29%)
Total	28	(100.00%)

Research Question 3

Do public high school principals in New York find that their own tenure status plays a significant role in their decision-making process?

Several items assessed participants' perceptions about the role of tenure status in their decision-making processes. Specifically, responses to items about the perceived impact of tenure on decision-making, long-range planning, commitment to one's district and the avoidance of difficult decisions were examined. First, participants were asked in Survey Question 11 to describe their perceptions of the relationship between their tenure status and decision-making. As presented in Table 11, a total of 78.57% felt that tenure had some impact on their decision-making. Analysis of responses by tenure status revealed that 54.55% of the tenured participants perceived that their tenure status had a moderate to great impact on their decision-making, compared to 33.33% of the untenured participants. There was no significant relationship between tenure status of the participants and decision-making responses to this item, $\chi^2 (3, N = 28) = 2.015, p > .05$.

Table 11

Impact of Tenure on Decision-making by Tenure Status

Impact Level	Tenured <i>f</i>	Untenured <i>f</i>	Total <i>f</i>	%
Great	2	0	2	7.14%
Moderate	10	2	12	42.86%
Minimal	5	3	8	28.57%
None	5	1	6	21.43%
Total	22	6	28	100.00%

Next, participants were asked in Survey Question 12 to describe their perceptions of the relationship between their tenure status and long-range planning. Results are presented in Table 12. Overall, more than three quarters of participants (78.57%) indicated that tenure has a measurable impact on long-range planning. Disaggregated by tenure status, 54.55% of tenured participants felt that their tenure status had at least a moderate impact on their long-range planning, as compared 33.33% of untenured participants. No significant differences between tenured and nontenured principals were found in the long-range planning responses to this question $\chi^2(3, N = 28) = 1.863, p > .05$.

Table 12

Impact of Tenure on Long-range Planning by Tenure Status

Impact level	Tenured <i>f</i>	Untenured <i>f</i>	Total <i>f</i>	%
Great	1	0	1	3.57%
Moderate	11	2	13	46.43%
Minimal	5	3	8	28.57%
None	5	1	6	21.43%
Total	22	6	28	100.0%

Then, participants were asked in Survey Questions 13 and 17 to report their perceptions of the relationship between their tenure status and commitment to their district. This item was worded for tenured and nontenured participants accordingly. Responses to both versions of this item are combined and presented by tenure status in Table 13. Exactly 25% of all participants stated they were, or would be, more committed to their district with tenure. The remaining participants stated that there was, or would be, no change to their commitment to their district with tenure. A Pearson chi-square analysis determined that there was no significant relationship between the participant's tenure status and their perceptions about tenure impacting commitment to their districts $\chi^2 (1, N = 28) = .283, p > .05$.

Table 13

Perceived Relationship between Tenure & Commitment to District by Tenure Status

Commitment	Tenured <i>f</i>	Untenured <i>f</i>	Total <i>f</i>	%
More committed	6	1	7	25%
No change	16	5	21	75%
Total	22	6	28	100%

Finally, participants were asked in Survey Questions 14 and 18 to report their perceptions of the relationship between their tenure status and the avoidance of difficult decisions. This item was worded for tenured and nontenured participants accordingly. Responses to both versions of this item are combined and presented by tenure status in Table 14. Of those who responded to this item, 71.43% reported that they did not avoid difficult decisions based on their tenure status. There was no significant relationship

between tenure status and reports of avoiding difficult decisions $\chi^2 (1, N = 27) = 0.220, p > 0.05$.

Table 14

Tenure Status & Avoidance of Difficult Decisions

Avoidance	Tenured <i>f</i>	Untenured <i>f</i>	Total <i>f</i>	%
Yes	6	1	7	25.00%
No	16	5	20	71.43%
No response	1	0	1	3.57%
Total	22	6	28	100%

In answering the research question, “Do public high school principals in New York find that their own tenure status plays a significant role in their decision-making process,” 78.5% of the principals surveyed stated that tenure has some impact on their decision-making and long-range planning. Principals surveyed (75%) stated that tenure does not affect their commitment to their district, and 71.43% stated that they did not avoid difficult decisions regardless of tenure status.

Research Question 4

Are public high school principals in New York in favor of repealing tenure for their position?

Principals were asked in Survey Questions 16 and 20 to report their personal beliefs about the current tenure system, by selecting one of four coded responses: a) the current system should be retained; b) tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision; c) tenure for principals should be abolished; and d) other, with an explanation. Table 15 presents 50% of the principals surveyed stated that tenure should

be revised, 39.29% stated that it should be retained, and 7.14% stated that it should be abolished. There was no relationship between participant tenure status and personal beliefs about the tenure system $\chi^2 (1, N = 28) = 2.661, p > 0.05$.

Table 15

Personal Beliefs about Current Tenure System

Tenure should be:	Tenured <i>f</i>	Untenured <i>f</i>	Total <i>f</i>	%
Retained	10	1	11	39.29%
Revised	10	4	14	50.00%
Abolished	1	1	2	7.14%
Other	1	0	1	3.57%
Total	22	6	28	100%

Research Question 5

Do demographic variables such as wealth of a school district, gender, school size (enrollment), years as principal or years in current position play a significant role in the views of public high school principals in New York as they relate to tenure?

It was hypothesized that a number of demographic variables, including wealth of the participant's school district, gender of the participant, size of the participant's school, and participant's years as principal, might play a significant role in participant perceptions about the necessity of tenure. Therefore, several chi-square analyses, each with an a priori alpha level of .05, were used to assess the relationship between such variables and participant responses.

Wealth of a school district

The first area to be examined was school wealth (as measured by the Need to Resource Capacity of the participant's school). This analysis compared N/RC group with perceptions about the necessity of principal tenure. As two participants failed to indicate the N/RC group for their school, 92.9% of the responses were usable (see Table 16 for response frequencies by N/RC). There was no significant relationship between school wealth (N/RC) and perceptions about the necessity of tenure $\chi^2 (3, N = 26) = 3.198, p > .05$.

Table 16

Need/Resource Capacity & Necessity of Tenure

N/RC Group	Is tenure necessary		Total <i>f</i>	%
	Yes <i>f</i>	No <i>f</i>		
Group 3	3	1	4	15.4%
Group 4	2	0	2	7.7%
Group 5	11	1	12	46.2%
Group 6	5	3	8	30.8%

The next analysis compared Survey Question 5-school wealth (Need to Resource Capacity) with Survey Questions 15 and 19 (perceived effectiveness of principals). Again, while 28 respondents indicated a response to the question, "How do you perceive your own effectiveness as a principal in regard to your tenure status", two principals failed to indicate the N/RC level for their school resulting in 26 usable answers. The results (see Table 17) indicate the wealth of a school as not significant in the perceived effectiveness of the principals surveyed $\chi^2 (3, N = 26) = 4.829, p > .05$.

Table 17

Relationship between N/RC (School Wealth) & Effectiveness & Tenure Status

Effectiveness with tenure	N/RC Group				Total
	43-45 <i>f</i>	46-48 <i>f</i>	49-51 <i>f</i>	52-53 <i>f</i>	<i>f</i>
More effective	1	1	10	5	17
No impact	3	1	2	3	9
Less effective	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	2	12	8	26

The next group of analyses was designed to see if there were significant differences in the principals' responses based on gender. As was seen previously in Table 7, 78.57% of respondents stated that tenure was necessary for public secondary school principals. In Table 18, responses are recorded by gender. There was no significant relationship between gender and perceptions about the necessity of tenure $\chi^2 (1, N = 28) = 3.055, p > .05$.

Table 18

Necessity of Tenure by Gender

Gender	Tenure necessary	Tenure unnecessary	Total
	<i>f</i> (%)	<i>f</i> (%)	<i>f</i> (%)
Male	14	6	20
Female	8	0	8
Total	22 (78.57%)	6 (21.43%)	28 (100.0%)

In Survey Questions 15 and 19, participants were asked to report their perceptions of their own effectiveness with regard to tenure status. This item was worded for tenured

and nontenured participants accordingly. Responses to both versions of this item are combined and presented by gender in Table 19. More than half of the participants (60.71%) perceived that they were, or would be, more effective in their position with tenure. Looking closer, the majority of male participants (70%) perceived that they are, or would be, more effective with tenure, while the majority of female participants (62.5%) responded that tenure status does not impact their effectiveness. A chi-square analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between gender and perceptions about tenure's impact on effectiveness, $\chi^2 (1, N = 28) = 2.530, p > 0.05$.

Table 19

Perceptions of Effectiveness & Temure Status by Gender

Effectiveness as principal	Male	Female	Total
	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i> (%)
More effective	14	3	17 (60.71%)
No impact on effectiveness	6	5	11 (39.29%)
Total	20	8	28 (100.00%)

A similar analysis was performed in order to determine if there were gender-based differences on the perceptions about tenure and commitment to district. Results are presented in Table 20. Seventy-five percent of both males and females stated that their tenure status does not play a role in their commitment to their district, while 25.0% of both males and females stated that they were, or would be, more committed to their district with tenure. No one responded that they would be less committed to their district if they were, or would, receive tenure. No significant differences between males and females with regard to commitment were found $\chi^2 (1, N = 28) = 1.000, p > .05$.

Table 20

Perceived Relationship between Tenure and Commitment to District, by Gender

<u>Commitment</u>	Gender		Total <i>f</i>
	Male <i>f</i> (%)	Female <i>f</i> (%)	
More committed	5 (25%)	2 (25%)	7
No Change	15 (75%)	6 (75%)	21
Total	20	8	28

School size

The next analysis compared Survey Question 6 school size, (enrollment) with Survey Question 8, “Do you believe tenure is necessary for school principals?” All respondents answered the question, “Do you believe tenure is necessary for school principals,” only 27 principals answered the question regarding school enrollment, resulting in 27 usable responses. As presented in Table 21, in schools with enrollment greater than 800 students, 92.9% of the principals in that category stated that tenure was necessary. In schools with enrollment between 400 and 800 students, 66.6% stated that tenure was necessary. Only 1 school responded with an enrollment less than 400, and that principal (100%) stated tenure was necessary for principals. Results from a Pearson chi-square test indicated that the relationship between school size and a perception of tenure being necessary was not significant at the .05 level $\chi^2 (2, N = 27) = 3.173, p > .05$.

Table 21

School Size (Enrollment) & Tenure Necessity

Enrollment	Is tenure necessary		Total <i>f</i> (%)
	Yes <i>f</i> (%)	No <i>f</i> (%)	
< 400 students	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)
400-800 students	8 (66.6%)	4 (33.3%)	12 (100.0%)
> 800 students	13 (92.8%)	1 (7.2%)	14 (100.0%)
Total	22 (81.4%)	5 (18.6%)	27 (100.0%)

Since only one school reported an enrollment of less than 400 students, another analysis was performed to see whether there was a relationship between enrollment and responses to the question, “Do you believe tenure is necessary for school principals” when dividing enrollment into two categories: less than 800 students and more than 800 students. However, no significant results comparing the relationship between school size and a perception of tenure being necessary were found $\chi^2 (1, N = 27) = 2.494, p > .05$.

Years as principal

This analysis compared Survey Question 1 (years as principal) with the Survey Question 8, “Do you believe tenure is necessary for school principals,” and is illustrated in Table 22. It was found that 75% of principals responding to the survey with 3 years or less experience as principal revealed tenure was necessary. A total of 80% of principals with 4 to 10 years experience felt tenure was necessary. Moreover, 72.7% of principals with 11 to 20 years experience felt tenure was necessary. Finally, 100% of principals with more than 20 years experience felt tenure was necessary. However, results from a chi-

square test indicated that there was no significant relationship between years as principal and a perception of tenure being necessary $\chi^2 (3, N = 27) = .780, p > .05$.

Table 22

Number of Years as Principal & Tenure Necessity for School Principals

Years as Principal	Is tenure necessary		Total <i>f</i> (%)
	Yes <i>f</i> (%)	No <i>f</i> (%)	
< 4 years	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
4-10 years	8 (80%)	2 (20.0%)	10 (100%)
11-20 years	8 (72.2%)	3 (27.3%)	11 (100%)
>20 years	2 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (100%)
Total	21 (77.8%)	6 (22.2%)	27 (100%)

Years in current position

This analysis compared Survey Question 2 (years as principal in the current position) with the Survey Question 8, “Do you believe tenure is necessary for school principals?” All respondents answered this question. It was found that 85.7% of principals with 3 years or less experience in their current position felt tenure was necessary. Moreover, 78.6% of principals responding to the survey with 4 to 10 years experience in their current position felt tenure was necessary (see Table 23). Finally, 71.4% of principals with 11 to 20 years experience in their current position felt tenure was necessary. However, no significant relationship was found between years as principal in the current position and a perception of tenure being necessary $\chi^2 (2, N = 28) = .424, p > .05$.

Table 23

Number of Years in Current Position & Tenure Necessity

Years in current position	Is tenure necessary		Total <i>f</i> (%)
	Yes <i>f</i> (%)	No <i>f</i> (%)	
< 4 years	6 (87.5%)	1 (14.3%)	7 (100%)
4-10 years	11 (78.6%)	3 (21.4%)	14 (100%)
11-20 years	5 (71.4%)	2 (28.6%)	7 (100%)
Total	22 (78.6%)	6 (21.4%)	28 (100%)

To answer the various demographic questions contained in Research Question 5, “Do demographic variables such as wealth of a school district, gender, school size, or years as principal play a significant role in the views of public high school principals in New York as they relate to tenure?” several Pearson chi-square analyses were used each with an a priori alpha level of .05. In all cases, there appeared to be no significance at the .05 level to the necessity of tenure and wealth of a school district, gender of the respondent, school size, or years as principal.

Summary

The research identified 50 schools within the identified counties for this survey. All 50 school principals received an e-mailed electronic survey simultaneously. Of those school principals receiving the survey, 28 out of 50 schools responded by the deadline, providing the researcher with a 56% return rate. It was found that the majority of principals felt that tenure was necessary. A majority of principals suggested that tenure increased their effectiveness, and that it helped the creation of more effective schools. More than three quarters of principals suggested that tenure had some impact on their decision-making and long-range planning, but no effect on commitment to their district or on avoiding decisions that might affect their employment.

Pearson chi-square tests were performed to assess for significant differences based on principal gender, wealth of the school, school enrollment, years as principal, and years in the current position in the perceptions about the necessity of a tenure system. However, no significant differences between these groups were found.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Research Question 1

What are the attitudes of public high school principals in New York with regard to tenure?

The majority of the principals responding (78.6%) believed that tenure is necessary for principals. It is worth noting that this proportion aligns with those obtained by Semendinger (2000) in New Jersey, as in that sample 86.4% of respondents felt that tenure was necessary. Therefore, principals in New York and New Jersey appear to support the need for tenure.

In the present study, respondents went on to describe in detail the reasons that they believed this to be true. One quarter of the principals surveyed cited the political nature of the educational environment and the precarious position that politics place them in as they try to lead, motivate, and manage their schools. Peterson and Cosner's (2005) research qualified the complex nature this way, mentioning that "principals face a variety of problem areas (instructional, political, psychosocial) and a mosaic of constituents (parents, teachers, students, community members)" (p. 29). Normore (2004) helps illustrate this point by observing that, "for school administrators, the main problem is not the absence of innovations in schools but the presence of too many disconnected, episodic, piecemeal, superficially adorned projects" (p. 71). Fullan (1999) asserted that principals are faced with "turbulent, uncertain environments and suffer an additional burden of having a torrent of unwanted, uncoordinated policies and innovations raining on them from hierarchical bureaucracies" (p. 38). As a result, "school administrators find

themselves managing and leading schools in a culture of change that directly places them on the edge of chaos” (Normore, 2004, p. 71). The current research, as well as the perceptions derived from this survey, indicates that tenure is an important safeguard against arbitrary dismissals, but more importantly it allows principals to be the educational leaders they are asked to become. The principals in this survey report that tenure afforded them the opportunity to lead with confidence and without fear and to take risks to innovate, adapt and develop instructional strategies to meet the needs of the 21st century.

It merits comment that the majority of principals responding thought tenure was necessary and the majority of those responding had tenure. A closer investigation of related response frequencies indicated that this pattern was a coincidence.

Research Question 2

According to public high school principals in New York, what is the impact of principal tenure on the creation of effective schools?

Several questions were utilized to compose a response to this question. The first question asked about predominant characteristics of effective schools, and the most frequent responses were a high-quality professional staff, followed by an academic focus, effective leadership, a safe and nurturing environment, and a student-centered approach or focus. These responses are consistent with the contemporary research of Chapter 2 (Lezotte, 1991a; NASE, 1999; Walters et al., 2003).

The second question asked what role tenure had in the creation of effective schools. More than half (55.5%) of the principals surveyed felt that tenure had a direct effect on the creation of effective schools. Their rationale for this belief included the

elimination or reduction of outside political pressure afforded by tenure. Principals also indicated tenure allowed them to make difficult decisions without fear, thereby allowing them to take leadership risks and to lead with confidence. These protections, afforded by tenure, enabled principals the ability to do their jobs without arbitrary or negative popular repercussions. Substantiating the belief that tenure aids in the creation of effective schools may be the recent findings by Krishnan (2005) that duration of service enhances the effect of leadership. In their Executive Summary, *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*, Leithwood et al., (2004) showed that different forms of leadership are described by a variety of adjectives that, in essence, all describe the same objectives critical to effectiveness. Therefore, tenure, and the longevity it provides, may contribute to lasting effective change.

Principals were also asked about their perceptions of their own effectiveness with regard to their tenure. Results showed that 60.7% of principals felt that they were, or would be, more effective with tenure, with no significant differences between males and females. This is an important indicator given that, “leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school” (Leithwood et al., 2004, p. 3). It is worth noting that these results were in contrast with those found by Semendinger (2000). In that study, it was found that 60.5% of New Jersey principals felt that there was, or would be, no change in their effectiveness with tenure. This difference might be indicative of different perceptions about tenure between New York and New Jersey principals.

Goodwin et al. (2003) addressed autonomy in their research and reported, “Principals argued that a loss of autonomy brought about by legislative and bureaucratic

mandates conflicted with a sense of responsibility to build the relationships that generate and nurture student growth and development, the purpose of the school” (p. 31). It could be argued that tenure might provide a form of autonomy through the ability to lead without fear of political reprisal.

Research Question 3

Do public high school principals in New York find that their own tenure status plays a significant role in their decision-making process?

New York principals expressed their beliefs that tenure had an important impact on both their decision-making and long-range planning while simultaneously reporting it had no impact on their commitment to their districts.

More than three quarters (78.6%) of respondents felt that tenure had some impact on their decision-making, with 50% responding that tenure had a moderate-to-great impact on their decision-making process. As stated earlier in the basis for this research, this overwhelming response may be attributed to the political volatility that tenure possesses within New York State. The research is clear that effective leaders build and guide effective schools (Leithwood et al., 2004; Lezotte, 1991a). If an educational leader is influenced by external pressures and must be mindful of the political or unpopular repercussions of their actions, it is reasonable to assume that that the most appropriate decisions or choices may not always be the ones selected or followed. This may be considered a design flaw in a plan of leadership, that principals would be asked to lead with a sword of Damocles over their heads and epitomizes the imminent and ever-present threat to job security faced by a principal in a position of power. It is a logical observation to conclude that decisions made under perceived duress may not always be

the most objective, effective, or successful strategies to be employed. As a result of their comprehensive meta-analysis, Marzano et al. (2005) concluded that a “highly effective school leader can have a dramatic influence on the overall academic achievement of students” (p. 10). The importance of principal tenure cannot be understated if effective leadership and educational change by innovative leaders remain national priorities.

One quarter of the principals indicated that with tenure they were more committed to their districts. The remaining 75% indicated there was, or would be, no change to their commitment to their district with tenure. The observation of this indicator provides no clear-cut justification of this response other than offering the impression that principals are often characterized by integrity and focus for their mission. Whether principals achieve their goals in one district or the next, they are confident that their drive and commitment will remain a constant personal fuel for their success.

Overall, the findings about perceptions of the relationship of tenure with decision-making and long-range planning were consistent with those of the New Jersey sample examined by Semendinger (2000). Semendinger found that the majority of the surveyed principals in his sample felt that tenure had some impact on decision-making and long-range planning. This provides additional support for the observation that principals feel tenure is necessary for the development of effective schools but do not feel tenure has an impact on their own administrative abilities.

Research Question 4

Are public high school principals in New York in favor of repealing tenure for their position?

It was found that 89.3% of the principals surveyed in this New York State study were

not in favor of repealing tenure for their position. These findings are consistent with those of Semendinger (2000), who found using a sample of principals located in New Jersey that 91.1% were not in favor of repealing tenure for their position. It is interesting to note, however, that 50% of the principals surveyed in New York State stated that the current system of tenure for principals is necessary, but should be revised (this proportion was somewhat higher than Semendinger's, who found that 32.9% of principals in New Jersey stated the current tenure system should be revised). This may well be an aspect of the fact that the removal of tenure has gained foothold in the State of New York and, thus, an added sense of urgency or concern to the discussion. Political and media agendas inundate schools. Popular corporate models with simple raise-the test-score solutions to complex problems have gained wide spread acceptance. Parents may be unreasonable in their demands or completely absent from their child's life. Education needs principals who understand that schools are human endeavors (Rooney, 2000). Despite these rigorous demands, an effective leader has the power to help teachers and students learn and grow in countless untold ways. To accomplish all of this, however, principals in this study were relatively adamant about the necessity of protection for their position and the difficult choices and challenges that they are faced with on a daily basis.

The aforementioned findings were consistent with those of Semendinger (2000) and his research of New Jersey State principals. In his summary, Semendinger stated, "Principals see the necessity of maintaining the system that offers them due process and a large degree of job protection" (Semendinger, 2000, pp. 82-83). Further, Fullan (2002) wrote, "For leaders to be able to deal with complex problems, what Heifetz (1994) called *Leadership Without Easy Answers*, they need at least 10 years of cumulative development

on the job” (p. 12). Additionally, school success is often created by principals who take risks and seize opportunities (Teske & Schneider, 1999). The majority (78.6%) of New York principals surveyed feel that tenure does affect their decision-making or long-term planning and a full 50% feel it should be revised. Thus, if principals who are strong instructional leaders are an essential part of school effectiveness, and time on task is important in the administration of successful schools, and change may necessitate risk-taking, then the topic of tenure, albeit with revision, appears to be a non-negotiable item for the New York State principals surveyed.

Research Question 5

Do demographic variables such as wealth of a school district, gender, school size, or years as principal play a significant role in the views of public high school principals in New York as they relate to tenure?

It was hypothesized that a number of demographic variables, including wealth of the participant’s school district, gender of the participant, size of the participant’s school, and participant’s years as principal, might play a significant role in participant perceptions about the necessity of tenure. This question explored the relationships between school district wealth, school size, gender of the principals responding, years of experience, and principal views on tenure (specifically, perceptions about whether tenure is necessary). Through a series of questions designed to assess principals’ attitudes and perceptions with regard to the importance of tenure, it was found that the majority (78.6%) of principals surveyed believed that tenure is an important safeguard afforded them in the administration of effective schools. However, no significant relationship

between school district wealth, school size, gender of the principals responding, years of experience, and principal views on tenure were found.

Final Conclusions

As a result of the participation and responses recorded in this survey, a clear majority of New York State principals surveyed feel that principal tenure is a necessary and important element in the creation of successful, effective schools. This is consistent with the research noted previously of Lezotte (1991a), Semendinger (2000), Walters et al. (2003), Czerwinka (2005), and Marzano et al. (2005). A total of 78.6% of the respondents clearly indicated a preference for, and the necessity of, tenure for principals. These conclusions were attained through a variety of survey questions addressing demographic variables. Demographic analysis of principal gender, school size, school wealth, years as principal and years in the current position was considered in evaluating principal responses. While the variables measured had no significant impact on the results, the consistent response indicated the necessity and preference for principal tenure. A total of 67 responses were grouped into 14 categories regarding characteristics of effective schools. These categories and the top responses (professional staff, academic focus, effective leadership, safe environment, student-centered focus) provided by the respondents were consistent with the current research on the topic of effective schools typified by Leithwood et al. (2004) and demonstrated a consistency in the prevailing attitudes and beliefs regarding effective schools in those principals surveyed.

Principals were asked if tenure had an impact on their decision-making and long-range planning. The same number of respondents that felt tenure was necessary (78.6%) felt that tenure affected their decision-making and long range planning. This statistic

combined with the fact that 60.7% felt they were, or would be, more effective with tenure helps illustrate the importance that tenure holds among New York State principals surveyed. The potential relationship between tenure and effectiveness cannot be overlooked as cited in Bauck (1987), Teske and Schneider (1999), and Semendinger (2000). These results point to my conclusion that tenure is an important and necessary critical element in the development of effective schools. Principal tenure that allows focused work in a politically pressure-free administrative environment can foster the development of effective educational institutions that are truly in the best interest of children.

Principals were asked if they were in favor of repealing tenure for their position. A resounding 89.3% of the respondents indicated that tenure was necessary and should be retained or revised. Perhaps, this substantiates the belief that tenure aids in the creation of effective schools as outlined in the recent findings by Krishnan (2005) that duration enhances the effect of leadership. Within this group of respondents, 50% indicated an interest in revising the present system of tenure, while the majority maintained tenure's importance and necessity.

In light of the data presented, with comparisons to the current research from the field to substantiate the observations and conclusions offered, I conclude that tenure is a critical job protection for principals as well as an important contributor to the creation of effective schools in the minds of the principals surveyed. Tenure remains an often misunderstood protection by the general population. The tenure process gives administrators a guaranteed right to a formal legal procedure if allegations of wrongdoing are filed against them. Tenure, once granted, becomes a guaranteed system of due

process, not a guarantee of lifetime employment. Tenure, simply stated, has contributed to the elimination of much of the politics and arbitrary discrimination formerly found in principal dismissals. It is with the sustainable leadership, vision, and commitment of an effective principal, free of political pressure, that an effective school can develop and flourish to meet the unimaginable challenges of the 21st century. The removal of tenure is seen by this researcher as the chipping away at the foundation of effective schools. As mentioned in Cooley and Shen (2003), "Fragmentation in program development and implementation, limited direction, and an absence of adequate support from central offices contribute to a cycle of ineffectiveness that continues to plague many school districts" (p. 21).

I make the recommendation that tenure be preserved in intent, as a guaranteed system of due process, and that all who find themselves in a position to alter this important protection take heed of the attitudes and perceptions of the very people who are in the forefront of implementing the positive educational change our children need and deserve.

Recommendations for Policy Making

Principals surveyed felt that tenure has a measurable effect on the development of effective schools. Time and again there is reference in this study, and the others noted, to the presence of political influence or "politics" playing into a principal's decision-making abilities and leadership. A guaranteed system of due process is important to the overall ability to lead without fear, to lead with confidence and to allow risk taking as principals innovatively meet the needs of our children.

1. It is recommended that all involved in the regulation of administrative leadership in New York State, specifically the principalship, carefully regard any attempt to remove tenure as a guaranteed system of due process.
2. It is recommended that the removal of tenure for New York City principals be carefully and objectively measured in a longitudinal manner with regard to the development of effective school outcomes and not short-term gains.
3. It is recommended that a comparative analysis of New York City schools and New York State schools be considered with regard to the effective schools research (Lezotte, 1991a; Leithwood et al., 2004) before any discussion of the removal of due process enters the legislature of New York.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this research presented the importance of principal tenure to New York State principals in the development of effective schools. Questions that remain to be answered and are not addressed in this body of research include:

1. Investigate further the perception by the principals in this study that tenure “moderately-to-greatly” impacts their decision-making and long-term planning but does not greatly impact their commitment to their district.
2. Investigate further the perception by the principals in this study that tenure “moderately-to-greatly” impacts their decision-making but does not significantly affect their avoidance of difficult decisions.
3. Investigate further the perceptions of tenure held by a larger number of female administrators not available in this body of research.

4. Investigate further the relationship between student academic achievement and principal tenure and principal effectiveness.
5. Replicate this study with additional demographic variables that may include: avenues to the principalship, mentoring programs, administrative preparation programs, as well as additional demographic data from other Need to Resource Capacity groups.
6. Replication of this study comparing the results of a self-reporting principal's survey and a superior's evaluation to confirm the principal's perceptions might provide a more comprehensive view of the relationship between tenure and effectiveness.
7. Limitations of this study make replication necessary with a larger population to confirm inferences and observations.

Additional data provided by similar studies will provide a wider understanding of the impact of tenure on principal performance.

Summary

This study was limited to 28 high school principals responding to the survey from New York State. The principals were selected based on a mirrored sample of the state's distribution of N/RC classification. By surveying principals from various schools representing the state distribution, I sought to capture a representative sample of the state population. While the study examined data from principals of various sized districts from around New York State, a complete representation of all of the schools in the state was not guaranteed. There is a possibility that principals electing not to participate in this survey may have held different beliefs and opinions not represented by the responses of

the participants in this survey. The assumption is also made that those principals responding to the survey have done so with candor and the responses represent their actual beliefs. Regardless of these limitations, valuable information was collected in this research that may not have been obtainable through other means.

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of active public high school principals as they relate to tenure and principal effectiveness, determine if there is a difference between the attitudes of tenured and nontenured principals as they relate to tenured principal effectiveness, and determine if tenure status plays a role in current principals' decision-making process. A sample of 28 high school principals located in New York was examined in order to address these objectives. It was found that the majority of principals felt that tenure was necessary. A majority of principals suggested that tenure increased their effectiveness and that it helped the creation of more effective schools. More than three quarters of principals suggested that tenure had some impact on their decision-making and long-range planning, but no effect on commitment to their district or on avoiding decisions that might affect their employment. No significant differences due to tenure status were found in these perceptions. Finally, no significant differences due to principal gender, wealth of the school, school enrollment, years as principal, and years in the current position were found in the perceptions about the necessity of a tenure system.

References

References

- Bauck, J. (1987). Characteristics of the effective middle school principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 71(500), 90-92.
- Bezzina, C. (2006). The road less traveled: Professional communities in secondary schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(2), 159-167.
- Blase, J. & Kirby, P.C. (2000). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do (2nd ed.)*, New York: Corwin Press.
- Brandt, R. (1982). On school improvement: A conversation with Ronald Edmonds. *Educational Leadership*, 40(3), 12-15.
- Buckner, K. (2000). *Tenure and employment contracts: Evolving standards for principals. A Legal Memorandum*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2005). *Occupational employment statistics*. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from http://146.142.4.22/oes/2005/may/oes_stru.htm#25-0000
- Chaika, G. (1998). The principles of principal assessment. *Education World*, Retrieved April 21, 2007, from http://www.educationworld.com/a_admin/admin/admin079.shtml
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D. & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education & Welfare. Office of Education.
- Cooley, V.E., & Shen, J. (2000). Factors influencing applying for urban principalship. *Education and Urban Society*, 32(4), 443-454.
- Copland, M. (2001). The myth of the superprincipal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(7), 528-533.

- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Czerwonka, F. L. (2005). *Variance of student achievement based on high school principal leadership practices, size of school, and tenure of principal*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations AAT 3185051
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *Teachers College Record*, 106(6), 1047-1085.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1998). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 43-64.
- Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment (DIIA). (2007). The University of Texas at Austin, Measurement and Evaluation Center. Retrieved January 25, 2008, from <http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/assessment/iar/teaching/gather/method/survey-Response.php>
- Duncan-Poitier, J. (2003). *Proposed amendment to the regulations of the commissioner of education relating to requirements for educational leadership programs*. Albany, NY: The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 20.

- Educational Research Service (ERS). (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Educational Research Service (ERS). (1996). Breaking ranks: Changing an American institution. (National Association of Secondary School Principals). *NASSP Bulletin*, 80(578), 55-66.
- Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute.
- Fenwick, L., & Pierce, M. (2001). The principal shortage: Crisis or opportunity. *Principal*, 80(4), 24-32.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2000). The return of large scale reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 1(1), 1-23.
- Fullan, M. (2002, March). *Principals as leaders in a culture of change*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: University of Ontario. Retrieved December 10, 2007, from http://www.michaelfullan.com/Articles_02/03_02.htm
- Geering, A. (1980). The role of the school principal in comparative perspectives. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED199930). Retrieved April 2, 2007, from ERIC database.
- Gentilucci, J.L., & Muto, C.C. (2007). Principals' influence on academic achievement: The student perspective. *NASSP Bulletin*, 91(3), 219-236.
- Glasman, N.S. & Heck, R. (1993). The changing leadership role of the principal: implications for principal assessment. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 48(1), 1-8.

- Glickman, C.D. (2001). Holding sacred ground: The impact of standardization. *Educational Leadership*, 58(4) 46-51.
- Goodwin, R.H., Cunningham, M.L., & Childress, R. (2003). The changing role of the secondary principal. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), 26-42.
- Grubbs, S., Leech, D.W., Gibbs, A., & Green, R. (2002). *Who's leading our South Georgia schools? A profile of principals*. A paper presented at the Annual Georgia Education Research Association Conference, Savannah, GA.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful principal leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 26(4), 371-395.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-351.
- Hallinger, P. & Heck, R. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, P. & Leithwood, K. (1994). Exploring the impact of principal leadership. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 206-217.
- Hargraves, A., & Dean, F. (2003). Sustaining leadership (making improvements in education). *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(9), 693-700.
- Hausman, C., Crow, G., & Sperry, D. (2000). Portrait of the "ideal principal": Context and self. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 5-10.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Highsmith, S. F., & Rallis, M.C. (1986). The myth of the "Great Principal": Questions of school management and instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68(4), 300-04.
- Hutcheson, P. (1996). The corrosion of tenure: A bibliography. *Thought & Action*, 13(2), 89-106.
- Kaplan, L.S., Owings, W.A., & Nunnery, J. (2005). Principal quality: A Virginia study connecting interstate school leaders licensure consortium standards with student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(643), 28-44.
- Karweit, N. (1976). Quality of schooling: A Major Educational Factor. *Educational Researcher*, 5(2), 15-17.
- Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B. & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126(1), 17.
- Kersten, T., & Kersten, J. (2006). Career development: Have you considered school administration? *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 42(3), 120.
- Krishnan, V. R. (2005). Transformational leadership and outcomes: Role of relationship duration. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(5/6), 442-457.
- Lankford, R. H., O'Connell, R. W., & Wycoff, J. H. (2003, October). *Our next generation school leadership in New York State*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Lashway, L. (2002, Spring). Rethinking the principalship. *Research Roundup*, 18(3), 1-4.
- Lawshe, C.H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personal Psychology*, 28, 563-575.
- Leithwood, K. & Earl, L. (2000). Educational accountability effects: An international perspective. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 75(4), 1-8.

- Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). Executive summary: How leadership influences student learning. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.
- Leithwood, K.A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, Temple University: Laboratory for Student Success.
- Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1995). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice*. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1991a). *Correlates of effective schools: The first and second generation*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1991b). *Learning for all*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.
- Marzano, R.J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R.J., Walters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McAdams, R. (1998). The principalship: An international perspective. *Principal*, 77(3), 10-12, 14, 16.
- McLaughlin, L., & Hyle, A.E. (2001, April). *The school principal as change agent: An explanatory case study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle: WA.
- Mills, R. P. (2000, February). *Statement on school leadership*. Albany, NY: The State Education Department/State University of New York.

- Mitgang, L. D. (2002, November). *Beyond the pipeline: Getting the principals we need, where they are needed most*. Chicago: North Central Regional Education Laboratory.
- Nation at Risk, A: The imperative for educational reform. (1983). Retrieved March 12, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
- National Association for Schools of Excellence (NASE). (1999, April). *Leading America's schools: The critical role of principal*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Lab.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2001, May). *Leading learning communities: NAESP Standards for what principals should know and be able to do. A guide for those who care about creating and supporting quality in schools*. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- Newmann, F. (1997). Accountability and school performance: Implications for restructuring schools. *Harvard Education Review*, 67(1), 41-69.
- Newmann, F., King, M., & Youngs, P. (2000). Professional development that addresses school capacity: Lessons from urban elementary schools. *American Journal of Education*, 108(4), 259-263.
- New York State Board of Regents. (1999). *Growing tomorrow's leaders today: Preparing effective school leaders in New York State*. Albany, NY: The State University of New York.
- New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2005). *Computing Needs-to-Resource-Capacity-Index*. Retrieved April 13, 2007, from <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/repcrd2005/information/similar-schools/guide.shtml>

- New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2007a). *Information and reporting services-accountability*. Retrieved March 27, 2007, from <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/accountability/home.shtml>
- New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2007b). *Introduction to the Board of Regents*. Retrieved April 27, 2007, from <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/introreg.html>
- New York State Consolidated Law, Education, Tenure, Title 4 Article 61 § 3012 (1947). Retrieved March 27, 2007, from <http://public.leginfo.state.ny.us/menugetf.cgi?COMMONQUERY=LAWS>
- Nir, A. E., & Zilberstein-Levy, R. (2006). Planning for academic excellence: Tenure and professional considerations. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(5), 537-554.
- Normore, A. H. (2004). The edge of chaos: School administrators and accountability. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(1), 55-77.
- Normore, A. H. (2006, Spring). Leadership recruitment and selection in school districts: Trends and issues. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 40(1), 41-73.
- O'Connell, R.W., Brown, C. E., & Williams, J. A. (2005, October) *Profile of the New York State principalship*. Albany, NY: School Administrators Association of New York State.
- O'Donnell, R.J. & White, G.P. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(645), 56-71.
- Pataki, G. (1999). State of the State Address. Retrieved February 6, 2007, from http://nysl.nysed.gov/uhtbin/cgisirsi/20071113174712/SIRSI/0/518/0/38582224/Content/1?new_gateway_db=HYPERION&user_id=CATALOG

- Pataki, G. (2006). State of the State Address. Retrieved February 6, 2007, from http://nyslnysed.gov/uhtbin/cgiisirs/20071113174712/SIRSI/0/518/0/38582224/Content/1?new_gateway_db=HYPERION&user_id=CATALOG
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods (3rd ed.)* Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage.
- Peterson, K. (1999, February). Realities of principals' work. *Comprehensive Regional Assistance Center Consortium – Region V*, 2, 1-3. Retrieved April 19, 2007, from http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/archive/ccvi/pub/ReformTalk/2_99.pdf
- Peterson, K. (2001, January 1). The roar of complexity. *Journal of Staff Development*, 22(1), 18-21.
- Peterson, K., & Cosner, S. (2005). Teaching your principal. *Journal of Staff Development*, 26(2), 28-32.
- Piazza, A. G. (1996). *Principals' perceptions of decision-making related to tenure status*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations.AAT 9700026
- Portin, B. (2004). "The roles that principals play". *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 14-18.
- Rallis, S., & Highsmith, M. (1986). The myth of the great principal: Questions of school management and instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68(4), 300-304.
- Robelen, E. W. (2000, May 24). Alabama law-makers reach deal on principal tenure, teacher salaries. *Education Week*, 19(37), 24.
- Rooney, J. (2000, September). Survival skills for the new principal. *Educational Leadership*, 58(1), 77-78.
- Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4) 335-351.

- Rowan, B. Bossert, S. T. & Dwyer, D. C. (1983). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. *Educational Researcher*, 12(4), 24-31.
- Sammons, P. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. England, UK: London University Office for Standards in Education.
- Seyfarth, J.T. (1999). *The principal: New leadership for new challenges*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schiff, T. (2001). *Priorities and barriers in high school leadership: A survey of principals*. Retrieved April 22, 2007, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4002/is_200112/ai_n9016067/pg_1
- School Administrators Association of New York State (SANNYS). (2005). *Principal tenure*. Retrieved April 22, 2007, from <http://www.saanys.org>
- Semendinger, P.R. (2000). New Jersey public school principals' perceptions of the impact of tenure on principal performance. (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2000). Dissertation Abstracts International-A 61/04.
- Southworth, G. (2002). Instructional leadership in schools: Reflections and empirical evidence. *School Leadership and Management*, 22(1), 73-91.
- Spillane, J.P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- Spitzer, E. (2007a, January 7). *A contract for excellence*: Prepared speech for the New York State Legislature. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from http://www.ny.gov/governor/keydocs/0129071_speech_print.html

- Spitzer, E. (2007b). State of the State Address. Retrieved February 6, 2007, from http://nysl.nysed.gov/uhtbin/cgisirsi/20071113174712/SIRSI/0/518/0/38582224/Content/1?new_gateway_db=HYPERION&user_id=CATALOG
- Stiegelbauer, S. M. (1984). *More effective leadership for change: Some findings from the principal teacher interaction (PTI) study (Report No. 3207)*. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Tang, T. L., & Chamberlain, M. (2003). Effects of Rank, Tenure, Length of Service, and Institution on Faculty Attitudes toward Research and Teaching: The Case of Regional State Universities. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(2), 103-110.
- Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. London and New York: Falmer Press.
- Teske, P., & Schneider, M. (1999). *The importance of leadership: The role of school principals*. Arlington, VA: The Price Waterhouse Coopers Endowment for the Business of Government.
- Tirozzi, G. (2001). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(6), 434-439.
- Trial, K. Ed. (2000). Taking the lead: The role of the principal in school reform. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. *Connections*, 1(4), 1-9.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1999). *Conducting Educational Research 2nd ed.*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Walters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Regional Education Laboratory.

- Whitaker, K. (1999). Principal role changes and implications for principalship candidates. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 8(4), 352-362.
- Winter, P.A., & Morgenthal, J. R. (2002). Principal recruitment in a reform environment: effects of school achievement and school level on applicant attraction to the job. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(3), 319-340.
- Zepeda, S. (2004). Leadership to build learning communities. *Educational Forum*, 68(2), 144-151.
- Zigarelli, M.A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2), 103-110.

Appendix A
Survey Cover Letter

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to request your support, assistance and participation in completing an online survey examining the issue of Public High School Principal Tenure in New York State. This research is an evaluation of the attitudes and perceptions of principals from throughout New York State. This survey and the research it will support allows practicing High School Principals to give valuable input in the form of attitudes and opinions to those who may be called upon to vote or decide Principal Tenure in the near future. Your participation in this study will be an invaluable aid to the overall research.

I am conducting this research as a part of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Education from the Department of Education Administration and Supervision at Seton Hall University. This study and the research it supports have been approved by the Institutional Review Board of Seton Hall University.

The survey consists of sixteen questions. The first seven questions are demographic in nature and will guide the research in determining differences in demographic responses. The remaining nine questions seek input from principals regarding principal tenure and effectiveness.

Participation in the online survey is strictly voluntary. If you chose not to participate you may simply delete this email. If you would like to participate in this important research; please take the brief amount of time it takes to complete the voluntary online Principal Tenure Survey that follows and **submit it not later than August 27, 2007.**

This research will employ the Academic Survey System and Evaluation Tool (ASSET), an online-survey tool. The ASSET allows participants to respond to survey questions with a guarantee of anonymity. All responses and respondents will remain confidential and will not be identified individually in the resultant reporting. All data received via the Principal Tenure Survey will be maintained in a separate secure location to assure confidentiality. Your completion of the online survey will constitute your consent to participate in the study.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and participation in this important endeavor. I appreciate your professional support. If you have any questions or concerns about this research, or your participation, please do not hesitate to contact me or my advisor at the numbers listed below.

Sincerely,

Raymond G. Cooper, Doctoral Candidate, Seton Hall University, 845-662-3129

Dr. Mary Ruzicka, Research Advisor, Seton Hall University, 973-275-2723

Appendix B

Need to Resource Capacity Breakdown (2005)

Need to Resource Capacity Breakdown (2005)

District Need/Resource Capacity	SECONDARY SCHOOLS Numbers in these cells identify each group by group number for reference purposes & total number of schools in this group
Group #3 High N/RC Urban/Suburban	#43 – 9 schools #44 – 26 schools #45 – 11 schools
Group #4 High N/RC Rural	#46 – 30 schools #47 – 37 schools #48 – 13 schools
Group #5 Average N/RC	#49 – 77 schools #50 – 131 schools #51 – 53 schools
Group #6 Low N/RC	#52 – 31 schools #53 – 55 schools #54 – 26 schools

Appendix C

N/RC List by Group & County

Listing of N/RC Group by County

County	Group #3	Group #4	Group #5	Group #6	Total Schools
Albany	2	0	2	3	7
Allegany	0	3	0	0	3
Broome	2	1	7	0	10
Cattaraugus	1	6	1	0	8
Cayuga	0	0	5	0	5
Chautauqua	2	5	5	0	12
Chemung	3	0	2	0	5
Chenango	0	5	1	0	6
Clinton	1	2	3	0	6
Columbia	0	1	3	0	4
Cortland	0	3	1	0	4
Delaware	0	2	1	0	3
Dutchess	2	0	9	3	14
Erie	1	0	23	6	30
Essex	0	1	0	0	1
Franklin	0	3	1	0	4
Fulton	0	2	3	0	5
Genesee	1	0	1	0	2
Greene	0	1	3	0	4
Hamilton	0	0	0	1	1
Herkimer	0	4	1	0	5
Jefferson	1	2	3	0	6
Lewis	0	2	0	0	2
Livingston	0	1	5	0	6
Madison	0	1	4	0	5
Monroe	0	0	15	7	22
Montgomery	0	2	1	0	3
Nassau	4	0	12	36	52
Niagara	1	0	9	0	10
Oneida	2	2	8	0	12
Onondaga	0	0	11	2	13

Listing of N/RC Group by County (cont.)

County	Group #3	Group #4	Group #5	Group #6	Total Schools
Ontario	1	0	7	0	8
Orange	2	1	10	1	14
Orleans	0	2	1	0	3
Oswego	1	3	4	0	8
Otsego	0	0	2	0	2
Putnam	0	0	3	1	4
Rensselaer	3	0	5	0	8
Rockland	2	0	2	6	10
St. Lawrence	0	4	2	0	6
Saratoga	0	0	9	0	9
Schenectady	1	0	3	1	5
Schoharie	0	1	2	0	3
Schuyler	0	0	1	0	1
Seneca	0	2	1	0	3
Steuben	0	4	4	0	8
Suffolk	7	0	27	19	53
Sullivan	0	3	2	0	5
Tioga	0	3	2	0	5
Tompkins	0	1	6	0	7
Ulster	1	1	7	0	9
Warren	0	0	3	0	3
Washington	0	1	2	0	3
Wayne	0	5	4	0	9
Westchester	5	0	8	26	39
Wyoming	0	0	3	0	3
Yates	0	0	1	0	1
Total	46 (9.2%)	80 (16%)	261 (52.3%)	112 (22.4%)	499

Appendix D

County Breakdown of N/RC for selected sample

County Breakdown of N/RC for selected sample.

County	N/RC Group 3	N/RC Group 4	N/RC Group 5	N/RC Group 6	School Total
Alleghany		3			3
Broome	2	1	7		10
Herkimer		4	1		5
Onondaga			5	2	7
Putnam			3	2	5
Rockland	1		2	3	6
Schenectady	1		3	1	5
Westchester	1		5	3	9
Principals polled NYS	10%	16%	52%	22%	50
Principals by N/RC	9.2%	16%	52.3%	22.4%	499

Appendix E
Survey Questionnaire

Questionnaire Part I: **Demographic Information**

For questions 1-7: Please check the response that most accurately matches your situation or position.

1. Number of years as a principal? _____
2. Number of years in your current position? _____
3. Are you currently tenured in your position? _____ Yes _____ No
4. Current enrollment of your school? _____
5. Your District's "Need to Resource Capacity" group? _____
6. What grade levels does your school service? _____
7. Your sex: ____ Male ____ Female
8. Do you believe tenure is necessary for public school principals? _____ Yes _____ No

Questionnaire Part II: **Beliefs and Attitudes Towards Effective Schools and Principal Tenure**

9. What do you believe are the predominate characteristics of effective schools? (Please explain)

10. What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools? (Please explain)

11. Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your decision-making.

___ My tenure status greatly impacts my decision-making.

___ My tenure status moderately impacts my decision-making.

___ My tenure status has minimal impact on my decision-making.

___ My tenure status has no impact on my decision-making.

12. Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your long range planning.

___ My tenure status greatly impacts my long range planning.

___ My tenure status moderately impacts my long range planning.

___ My tenure status has a minimal impact on my long range planning.

___ My tenure status has no impact on my long range planning.

IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY TENURED,

PLEASE CONTINUE WITH QUESTION NUMBER 13.

IF YOU DO NOT PRESENTLY HAVE TENURE,

PLEASE CONTINUE WITH QUESTION NUMBER 17.

13. Since you have been granted tenure, how do you perceive your commitment to your district?

___ I am more committed to my district.

___ My tenure status does not play a role in my commitment to my district.

___ I am less committed to my district.

14. Before you were granted tenure, did you avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment? ☐ Yes (Please explain) ☐ No

15. How do you perceive your own effectiveness as a principal in regard to your tenure status?

☐ I am a more effective principal with tenure.

☐ My tenure status has no impact on my effectiveness as a principal.

☐ I am a less effective principal with tenure.

16. Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals.

☐ The current tenure system should be retained.

☐ Tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision.

☐ Tenure for principals should be abolished.

☐ Other: (Please explain)

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

Please complete the following questions if you

DO NOT currently have tenure.

17. How do you believe your commitment to your district will change if you are awarded tenure?

☐ I will be more committed to my district.

☐ My tenure status will not play a role in my commitment to my district.

☐ I will be less committed to my district.

18. Since you currently do not have tenure, have you had to avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment? ☐ Yes (Please explain) ☐ No

19. What role do you believe tenure will play in your own effectiveness as principal?

☐ I would be a more effective principal with tenure.

☐ My tenure status will not impact my effectiveness.

☐ I would be a less effective principal with tenure.

20. Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals.

☐ The current tenure system should be retained.

☐ Tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision.

☐ Tenure for principals should be abolished.

☐ Other: (Please explain)

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

Appendix F

Collated Data Survey Questions 1, 2, & 4

Principals' response to survey questions 1, 2, & 4.

Respndnt	YrsPrinc	YrsCurr	Enroll
1	12	1	600
2	10	3	2900
3	1	1	615
4	14	6	475
5	2	2	540
6	4	4	700
7	18	8	650
8		7	980
9	23	20	1566
10	7	7	1600
11	23	12	1450
12	8	8	700
13	16	11	700
14	15	15	
15	8	4	362
16	2	2	1800
17	16	14	500
18	15	8	763
19	6	4	1200
20	4	4	550
21	5	5	1300
22	14	14	850
23	15	10	1450
24	9	2	1050
25	13	8	900
26	18	18	570
27	1	1	985
28	6	6	1300
	Sum: 284.5	Sum: 204.5	Sum: 27056
	Mean: 10.53704	Mean: 7.303571	Mean: 1002.074
	StDev: 6.443431	StDev: 3.889087	StDev: 494.9747
	Mode: 15	Mode: 4	Mode: 700

Appendix G

Frequency Responses Survey Question 9

“What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?”

What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?

	Frequency	Percent
Academic focus	11	16.4%
Accountability	2	3.0%
Assessments	1	1.5%
Communication	2	3.0%
Effective leadership	9	13.4%
Goals	2	3.0%
Good discipline/positive behavior	1	1.5%
High quality professional staff	12	18.0%
Professional development	1	1.5%
Safe/positive/nurturing environment	9	13.4%
Shared vision/decision-making	1	1.5%
Student centered/focused	9	13.4%
Supportive parents/community	5	7.5%
Technology	1	1.5
Blank/no answer	1	1.5
Total Responses	67	100%

Appendix H

Collated Data Survey Question 9

“What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?”

Collated Data: What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?

	Frequency	Respondent #
Academic focus	11	1,4,9,6,11,12,13,16,17,26,27
Accountability	2	1,15
Assessments	1	3
Communication	2	14,24
Effective leadership	9	1,7,9,15,19,20,22,25,28
Goals	2	1,17
Good discipline/positive behavior	1	1
High quality professional staff	12	4,8,9,13,15,16,18,19,20,21,24,28
Professional development	1	28
Safe/positive/nurturing environment	9	1,3,4,8,11,12,13,14,27
Shared vision/decision-making	1	25
Student centered/focused	9	4,5,7,10,15,17,18,23,24
Supportive parents/community	5	1,16,18,24,28
Technology	1	28
Blank/no answer	1	2

Appendix I

Raw Data Survey Question 9

“What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?”

Raw Data: What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?

Respondent #	Response
1	Educational Mission that is promulgated throughout the community, well disciplined students, teacher accountability, Goals that are focused and held to some degree of accountability. Effective leadership at school, district office and bd of ed. Positive place
2	Blank/no answer
3	Teachers using common assessments. School culture conducive to learning.
4	Effective schools provide a safe, nurturing environment for students of all academic abilities and all races, religions, and cultures. Effective schools hire highly qualified teachers who are interested in students as human beings as well as in the subject...
5	Caring about each student
6	Focused on student achievement and learning
7	Have a good educational leader that is not afraid to "rock the boat"; when needed. An effective school puts the students first.
8	Safe school, qualified teaching staff, caring and nurturing individuals, positive learning environment, positive morale and school climate, challenging curriculum, solid extracurricular program and athletic program.
9	Strong programs - effective teachers - effective leadership
10	Effective schools consider the needs of all learners - from classified to AP
11	Effective schools prepare students, socially, emotionally, and academically for their present and future lives.
12	Positive learning climate Emphasis on ongoing improvement Analysis of data to inform decisions on curriculum & instruction
13	a quality academic program a safe environment a variety of activities to engage students adequate financial support a caring and nurturing staff
14	effective communication and school safety
15	STRONG LEADERSHIP - ADMINISTRATION THAT IS WILLING TO HOLD STAFF ACCOUNTABLE FOR PRESENTING AN UPDATED CURRICULUM USING THE BEST RESEARCH GROUNDED METHODS AND PRACTICES. TEACHERS WHO ARE CURRICULUM EXPERTS, STUDENT CENTERED IN THEIR CLASSROOM APPROACH...

Raw Data: What do you believe are the predominant characteristics of effective schools?

(cont.)

16	Caring staff strong academics effective parents
17	Effective schools have an academic focus....while managing the social and emotional needs of students keep a central emphasis upon preparing students for and keeping their attention on future endeavors, goals and aspirations.
18	Highly qualified and committed teachers who care about their students, co-workers and community.
19	Financial Support Articulated, well-aligned plan for instruction High-quality teachers Effective Leadership Support for objectives by BOE, Central Office, and public
20	Stable, competent leadership adequate financial resources passionate, dedicated teaching staff
21	A staff that cares about young people and is invested in all aspects of their growth. Students are motivated to learn because of the dedication and passion of the staff.
22	student centered focus commitment to excellence for all, high standards strong leadership continuous improvement collaboration amongst all stakeholders
23	High level of classroom creativity Commitment to students of all abilities Climate conducive to professional growth
24	High quality teachers Respect for students and staff and parents Open, honest and clear communications focus on ALL students needs
25	Collaborative leadership, shared vision and responsibilities of all members of the organization.
26	a place where students are academically challenged. to stretch students into the most rigorous courses we offer.
27	Effective schools provide students with an emotionally and socially safe environment in which to engage in meaningful academic experiences that prepare students to use their minds well, pursue areas of interest, and educate them to be productive citizens
28	Schools are most effective when they have a committed, highly competent professional staff, which is supported by a community that provides essential resources to allow for professional development, strong leadership, instructional technology...

Appendix J

Collated Data Survey Question 10

“What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools?”

What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools?

“Keyword” & # of responses	Principal Comment
“Political” & “Influence” – 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal needs to be protected from political agendas of bd of ed and district office • Tenure allows an administrator to advocate for people and program without the threat of politics or hidden agendas to come into play, and compromise decision-making. • Tenure helps “level the playing field” when the building administrator knows that the best educational decision he or she can make is opposed by the one of the many political influences in the larger school community and beyond. • A tenured principal has greater influence and power in a school district. The principals are trained to run schools and often serve extensive internships and training programs like an assistant principalship. An untenured principal is subject to the whims • The principal as leader needs to take tough, and at times, unpopular stands to move his/her school forward. Tenure enables a principal to do what needs to be done without politics taking over • It enables staff to be up front and honest about student performance without fear of loss of position for political reasons. • The principalship is a highly political position with powerful stake holder groups that can sometimes be opposed to meaningful change. Factors sometimes outside the control of the principal can pop up and create short-term, intense reactions among one or... • Tenure allows the school leader and his/her faculty the freedom to make decisions based on data and best practice without worrying about the influence of Board members or parents who disagree with policies or procedures because they have a child or a relative...
Without “Fear” – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership that can move forward the goals and initiatives without fear of the whims and vagaries of agenda-driven district administration. • a principal can implement new and maybe controversial programs without fear of retribution. • Principals need the authority and the confidence to act on what is best for the students. Sometimes that involves substantial change, which would not be attempted if a principal’s continued employment was always part of the equation.
Lead with “Confidence” – 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Makes employees comfortable to make tough choices for a student’s best interest. • If tenure gives the employee the confidence and the freedom to take chances and make decisions then it can be a positive factor in the creation of an effective school. • Although the most effective leaders do the same job before and after receiving tenure, tenure bestows a principal with a sense that he or she has a vote of confidence; this perception results in a positive psychological impact.

What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools? (cont.)

“Keyword” & # of responses	Principal Comment
“Risk” taking - 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the principal to take risks to make changes • Tenure allows a principal to take risks that s/he might not ordinarily take.
“Other” – 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sometimes progressive thinking brings about change. People, especially people who are influential in the community, don’t like what you are doing. Tenure has a way of allowing us to make decisions that are in the best interest of the students... • Provides stability in leadership in the school. Tenure should be renewable and not a “forever” thing. • Leaders make decisions which are not always popular or accepted by everyone. Tenure protects the leader. • Tenure does play a role because if the administrators do not evaluate a teacher as excellent we do not recommend that the Board of Education grants tenure. The teacher has three years to work towards excellence and mastering the craft of teaching. • Because of the structure of the system, principals are less likely to show “courageous” leadership without the security of tenure. • It keeps administrators on their toes, rather than coasting • I don’t believe it plays as major a role as one might think. I see it as both an obstacle and a strength, depending frankly on the individual. • If done correctly, tenure, or lack there of, weeds out those who are ineffective, who may be at the wrong level, who may for whatever reason should not be in a particular school... • It does not necessarily. The problem in my experience is that teacher unions have far too much influence over school boards...and therefore, over superintendent appointment and advancement. Tenure should be granted to all or none... • very little • It should not play a role.
Blank – 1	

Appendix K

Academic Survey System & Evaluation Tool (ASSET)

NYS Principals' Tenure Survey



asset: ACADEMIC SURVEY SYSTEM & EVALUATION TOOL

[View](#)
[Summary](#)
[Crosstabs](#)
[Details](#)
[Export](#)
[Back](#)

NYS Principals' Tenure Survey

The purpose of this study is to determine the attitudes of current public high school principals as they relate to tenure and principal effectiveness; comparing tenured and non-tenured in the decision making process.

[Surveys](#)

[Data](#)

[Lists](#)

[Users](#)

[Help](#)

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to request your support, assistance and participation in completing an online survey examining the issue of Public High School Principal Tenure in New York State. This research is an evaluation of the attitudes and perceptions of principals from throughout New York State. This survey and the research it will support allows practicing High School Principals to give valuable input in the form of attitudes and opinions to those who may be called upon to vote or decide Principal Tenure in the near future. Your participation in this study will be an invaluable aid to the overall research.

I am conducting this research as a part of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Education from the Department of Education Administration and Supervision at Seton Hall University. This study and the research it supports have been approved by the Institutional Review Board of Seton Hall University.

The survey consists of sixteen questions. The first seven questions are demographic in nature and will guide the research in determining differences in demographic responses. The remaining nine questions seek input from principals regarding principal tenure and effectiveness.

Participation in the online survey is strictly voluntary. If you chose not to participate you may simply delete this email. If you would like to participate in this important research; please take the brief amount of time it takes to complete the voluntary online Principal Tenure Survey that follows and **submit it not later than August 27, 2007.**

This research will employ the Academic Survey System and Evaluation Tool (ASSET), an online-survey tool. The ASSET allows participants to respond to survey questions with a guarantee of anonymity. All responses and respondents will remain confidential and will not be identified individually in the resultant reporting. All data received via the Principal Tenure Survey will be maintained in a separate secure location to assure confidentiality. Your completion of the online survey will constitute your consent to participate in the study.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and participation in this important endeavor. I appreciate your professional support. If you have any questions or concerns about this research, or your participation, please do not hesitate to contact me or my advisor at the

numbers listed below.

Sincerely,

Raymond G. Cooper, Doctoral Candidate, Seton Hall University, 845-662-3129

Dr. Mary Ruzicka, Research Advisor, Seton Hall University, 973-275-2723

Questionnaire Part I: Demographic Information For questions 1-7: Please indicate a response that most accurately matches your situation or position.

1. Number of years as principal?

2. Number of years in your current position?

3. Tenure

	Yes	No
Are you currently tenured in your position?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Current enrollment of your school?

5. What is your District's "Need to Resource Capacity" similar school group number, (i.e. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, or 54)? (Click [here](#) if you are unsure and follow the county map to your school's number)

6. What grade levels does your school service?

7. Gender

	Male	Female
Your sex?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Tenure

	Yes	No
Do you believe tenure is necessary for public school principals?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Questionnaire Part II: Beliefs and attitudes towards effective schools and principal tenure.

9. What do you believe are the predominate characteristics of effective schools? (Please explain)

10. What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools? (Please explain)

11. Tenure and Decision Making

	<i>My tenure status greatly impacts my decision making.</i>	<i>My tenure status moderately impacts my decision making.</i>	<i>My tenure status has minimal impact on my decision making.</i>	<i>My tenure status has no impact on my decision making.</i>
<i>Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your decision making.</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Tenure and Planning

	<i>My tenure status greatly impacts my long range planning.</i>	<i>My tenure status moderately impacts my long range planning.</i>	<i>My tenure status has minimal impact on my long range planning.</i>	<i>My tenure status has no impact my long range planning.</i>
<i>Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your long range planning.</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you are currently Tenured, please continue with question number 13. If you Do Not presently Have Tenure, please continue with question number 17.

13. Tenure and Commitment

	<i>I am more committed to my district.</i>	<i>My tenure status does not play a role in my commitment to my district.</i>	<i>I am less committed to my district.</i>
<i>Since you have been granted tenure, how do you perceive your commitment to your district?</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Before you were granted tenure, did you avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment? (Please answer "Yes" or "No" and explain)

--

15. Principal Effectiveness

	<i>I am a more effective principal with tenure.</i>	<i>My tenure status has no impact on my effectiveness as a principal.</i>	<i>I am a less effective principal with tenure.</i>
<i>How do you perceive your own effectiveness as a principal in regard to your tenure status?</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. Personal Beliefs on Tenure

	<i>The current tenure system should be retained.</i>	<i>Tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision.</i>	<i>Tenure for principals should be abolished.</i>	<i>Other.</i>
<i>Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals.</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If you are tenured, thank you for completing this survey. Please complete the following questions if you DO NOT currently have tenure.

17. Tenure and Commitment

	<i>I will be more committed to my district.</i>	<i>My tenure status will not play a role in my commitment to my district.</i>	<i>I will be less committed to my district.</i>
<i>How do you believe your commitment to your district will change if you are awarded tenure?</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. Since you currently do not have tenure, have you had to avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment? (Please answer "Yes" or "No" and explain)

--

19. Principal Effectiveness

	<i>I would be a more effective principal with tenure.</i>	<i>My tenure status will not impact my effectiveness.</i>	<i>I would be a less effective principal with tenure.</i>
<i>What role do you believe tenure will play in your own effectiveness as a principal?</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. Personal Beliefs on Tenure

	<i>The current tenure system should be retained.</i>	<i>Tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision.</i>	<i>Tenure for principals should be abolished.</i>	<i>Other.</i>
<i>Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals.</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you for completing this survey.

Appendix L

Summary Coding Questionnaire

Question in Excel Format with Coding of Responses

Q1	Number of years as principal?
Q2	Number of years in your current position?
Q3a	3. Tenure Are you currently tenured in your position?
	2 Yes
	4 No
Q4	Current enrollment of your school?
Q5	What is your District's "Need to Resource Capacity" similar school group number 3 - 43, 44, 45 4- 46, 47, 48 5- 49, 50, 51 6- 52, 53, 54
Q6	What grade levels does your school service?
Q7a	7. Gender Your sex?
	169535 Male
	169536 Female
Q8a	8. Tenure Do you believe tenure is necessary for public school principals?
	2 Yes
	4 No
Q9	What do you believe are the predominate characteristics of effective schools? (Please explain)
Q10	What role, if any, does tenure play in the creation of effective schools? (Please explain)
Q11a	11. Tenure and Decision-making Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your decision-making.
	2 My tenure status greatly impacts my decision-making.
	4 My tenure status moderately impacts my decision-making.
	6 My tenure status has minimal impact on my decision-making.
	8 My tenure status has no impact on my decision-making.

Question in Excel Format with Coding of Responses (cont.)

12. Tenure and Planning
Please mark the response that most closely describes the relationship between your tenure status and your long range planning.
- Q12a
- 2 My tenure status greatly impacts my long range planning.
 - 4 My tenure status moderately impacts my long range planning.
 - 6 My tenure status has minimal impact on my long range planning.
 - 8 My tenure status has no impact my long range planning.
13. Tenure and Commitment
- Q13a Since you have been granted tenure, how do you perceive your commitment to your district?
- 2 I am more committed to my district.
 - 4 My tenure status does not play a role in my commitment.
 - 6 I am less committed to my district.
- Q14 Before you were granted tenure, did you avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment? (Please answer "Yes" or "No" and explain)
- 2- Yes
 - 4- No
15. Principal Effectiveness
- Q15a How do you perceive your own effectiveness as a principal in regard to your tenure status?
- 2 I am a more effective principal with tenure.
 - 4 My tenure status has no impact on my effectiveness.
 - 6 I am a less effective principal with tenure.
16. Personal Beliefs on Tenure
- Q16a Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals.
- 2 The current tenure system should be retained.
 - 4 Tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision.
 - 6 Tenure for principals should be abolished.
 - 8 Other.
17. Tenure and Commitment
- Q17a How do you believe your commitment to your district will change if you are awarded tenure?
- 2 I will be more committed to my district.
 - 4 My tenure status will not play a role in my commitment.
 - 6 I will be less committed to my district.
- Q18 Since you currently do not have tenure, have you had to avoid any difficult decisions that might have affected your employment? (Please answer "Yes" or "No" and explain)

Question in Excel Format with Coding of Responses (cont.)

19. Principal Effectiveness
- Q19a What role do you believe tenure will play in your own effectiveness as a principal?
- 2 I would be a more effective principal with tenure.
 - 4 My tenure status will not impact my effectiveness.
 - 6 I would be a less effective principal with tenure.
20. Personal Beliefs on Tenure
- Q20a Explain your personal belief as it relates to tenure for principals.
- 2 The current tenure system should be retained.
 - 4 Tenure is necessary, but the current system is in need of revision.
 - 6 Tenure for principals should be abolished.
 - 8 Other.

Appendix M

Summary Coding Questionnaire

Questions 1-8, & 11-20

Questions 1-5 with raw data responses

Q1	Q2	Q3a	Q4	Q5
12	0.5	4	600	49
10	3	2	2900	50
1	1	4	615	51
14	6	2	475	46
2	2	4	540	50
4	4	2	700	5
17.5	8	2	650	4
0	7	2	980	50
23	20	2	1566	53
7	7	2	1600	49
23	12	2	1450	43
8	8	2	700	53
16	11	2	700	50
15	15	2		44
8	4	2	362	51
2	2	4	1800	44
16	14	2	500	47
15	8	2	763	49
6	4	2	1200	49
4	4	2	550	43
5	5	2	1300	52
14	14	2	850	
15	10	2	1450	53
9	2	4	1050	53
13	8	2	900	49
18	18	2	570	53
1	1	4	985	53
6	6	2	1300	54

Questions 6, 7, 8, 11, 12 with raw data responses

Q6	Q7a	Q8a	Q11a	Q12a
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169535	2	2	2
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169536	2	4	4
9-12	169535	4	6	6
9-12	169535	2	4	6
9-12	169535	4	8	8
9-12	169536	2	8	8
9-12	169535	2	8	8
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169536	2	2	4
9-12	169535	4	8	8
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169535	4	6	6
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169536	2	8	6
9-12	169535	2	6	6
9-12	169535	2	6	6
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169535	4	6	4
9-12	169536	2	6	6
9-12	169535	2	4	4
9-12	169535	2	6	8
9-12	169536	2	8	8
9-12	169535	4	4	4
9-12	169536	2	6	6
9-12	169536	2	4	4

Questions 13, 14 with raw data responses

Q13a	Q14
2	NO
4	None that I can think of. However, I became an administrator in my district after establishing myself as a successful teacher there first, so I did not have the credibility issues an administrator who came in from elsewhere might have.
4	,but I always made sure I had superintendent approval!!
4	No. I was hired as an educational leader and that is my main role as a school administrator
4	
4	Being non-tenured can make you overly cautious and sometimes reluctant
2	Yes. I was more reluctant to remove unsatisfactory employees.
2	No, because I must do what I ethically believe is right;however I also worked with a Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent who held similar beliefs to my own.
4	No. Decisions need to be made daily; to allow tenure to impact a decision is, in my opinion, ridiculous.
4	No, but I knew that difficult decisions could impact my longevity in a district. I certainly felt that the school board had greater influence over this as an untenured administrator, and I knew that decisions related to a board members personal agenda could impact my longevity in a district.
4	no
4	No. And as a result there was one point in my career where i had to barter my resignation for the tenure recommendation that i had earned through my performance. A new superintendent perceived me as a potential rival and traded his authority to "recommend" for my resignation and removal from the district. He was well aware that my performance before he came would assure that i would continue my career. As long as there are those who are amoral and unprofessional in positions of authority in the field of education, there will be a need for tenure. Unfortunately i am not alone. I have seen colleagues forced out for no other reason than a new superintendent wanted his or her "own" choice hired and had the opportunity to deny tenure to make it happen.
4	no
4	No, I did not...and boy was that a mistake....idealistically I tackled thorny issues head on... and the outcomes for kids, while great, stepped on toes that still have not healed a decade later...and have kept me from promotions.
2	No But I was always worried
4	Yes. I was more likely to avoid initiatives which might be viewed as a challenge to the status quo.
4	Yes, there were issues that I knew were politically charged issues that I was not willing to take on without tenure.
4	I don't think I necessarily avoided difficult decisions but I will admit that my decision-making was affected prior to being granted tenure. I was more cautious in making decisions and considered the political implications more.
2	No - but I was painfully aware that each and everyone could result in a back lash that could result in my lookign for another job.
4	Yes. At times, I hesitated before making a decision that might have created controversy with a group of staff members who had political influence and might affect my tenure.
4	No. I was as forthright and outspoken pre-tenure as I am post-tenure. It's just nice to know that my actions have more security tied to them, but lack of security did not change how I did my job.
2	no.....a principal can´t operate in fear.
4	No. I believe my decisions were always based on what was best for the members of the school community, but I also believe that I now make decisions with the same motivation and less anxiety about taking the stand to do what is right.

Questions 15-17 with raw data responses

Q15a	Q16a	Q17a
		4
2	4	
		2
2	2	
		4
4	2	2
4	6	
4	2	
2	4	
2	4	
2	2	
4	4	
2	2	
4	4	
2	2	
4	4	4
4	8	
2	2	
2	4	
4	4	
2	4	
2	4	
2	2	
		4
4	4	
2	2	
		4
4	2	

Questions 18-20 with raw data responses

Q18	Q19a	Q20a
no	2	2
	2	4
Yes. I think all administrators have to navigate certain political minefields, regardless if they have tenure or not. The decisions I have made in which politics have played a piece I dont think affected my employment per se, but it may have upset a board member who may have said something and the snowball effect begins.	2	4
No, I act in the best interest of my students	2	6
	4	4
Had to deal very delicately with "high powered" parents requests for special favors in teacher selection.	2	4
No This is primarily because I have a supportive central administration who hired me because of my abilities and has been supportive through some difficult decisions.	4	4

Appendix N

Summary Chi-square Analysis

RQ – 1 & SQ – 3 & 8
Are you Tenured & Is Tenure Necessary p. 36, Table 7
Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
are you currently tenured *						
is tenure necessary?	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

are you currently tenured * is tenure necessary? Crosstabulation

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
are you currently	yes	Count	17	5	22
tenured		Expected Count	17.3	4.7	22.0
	no	Count	5	1	6
		Expected Count	4.7	1.3	6.0
Total		Count	22	6	28
		Expected Count	22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.103(b)	1	.748		
Continuity	.000	1	1.000		
Correction(a)					
Likelihood Ratio	.108	1	.743		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.617
Linear-by-Linear	.099	1	.753		
Association					
N of Valid Cases	28				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 3 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.29.

RQ – 3 & 14 & 18
Role of Tenure in Decision-making & Are you Tenured p. 39, Table 11

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
role of tenure in decision-making * are you currently tenured	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

role of tenure in decision-making * are you currently tenured Crosstabulation

			are you currently tenured		Total
			yes	no	yes
role of tenure in decision- making	GREATLY	Count	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.6	.4	2.0
	MODERATELY	Count	10	2	12
		Expected Count	9.4	2.6	12.0
	MINIMALLY	Count	5	3	8
		Expected Count	6.3	1.7	8.0
	NOT AT ALL	Count	5	1	6
		Expected Count	4.7	1.3	6.0
	Total	Count	22	6	28
		Expected Count	22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.015(a)	3	.569
Likelihood Ratio	2.291	3	.514
Linear-by-Linear Association	.334	1	.564
N of Valid Cases	28		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .43.

RQ – 3 & SQ - 12**Does Tenure Status Impact LR Planning by Tenure Status p. 40, Table 12****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
role of tenure in planning * are you currently tenured	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

role of tenure in planning * are you currently tenured Crosstabulation

			are you currently tenured		Total
			yes	no	yes
role of	GREATLY	Count	1	0	1
tenure in		Expected Count	.8	.2	1.0
planning	MODERATELY	Count	11	2	13
		Expected Count	10.2	2.8	13.0
	MINIMALLY	Count	5	3	8
		Expected Count	6.3	1.7	8.0
	NOT AT ALL	Count	5	1	6
		Expected Count	4.7	1.3	6.0
Total		Count	22	6	28
		Expected Count	22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.863(a)	3	.601
Likelihood Ratio	1.942	3	.584
Linear-by-Linear Association	.246	1	.620
N of Valid Cases	28		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

RQ – 3 & SQ - 13 & 17**How do you perceive Commitment by Tenure Status p.41, Table 13****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Tenure & Commitment * are you currently tenured	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

Tenure & Commitment * are you currently tenured Crosstabulation

			are you currently tenured		Total
			yes	no	yes
Tenure & Commitment	MORE	Count	6	1	7
		Expected Count	5.5	1.5	7.0
	NO CHANGE	Count	16	5	21
		Expected Count	16.5	4.5	21.0
Total		Count	22	6	28
		Expected Count	22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.283(b)	1	.595		
Continuity Correction(a)	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.302	1	.583		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.522
Linear-by-Linear Association	.273	1	.602		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.50.

RQ – 3 & SQ – 3, 14 & 18**Are you Tenured & Did you Avoid Difficult Decisions p.41, Table 14****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Tenure & Difficult Decisions * are you currently tenured	27	96.4%	1	3.6%	28	100.0%

Tenure & Difficult Decisions * are you currently tenured Crosstabulation

			are you currently tenured		Total
			yes	no	yes
Tenure & Difficult Decisions	YES	Count	5	2	7
		Expected Count	5.4	1.6	7.0
	NO	Count	16	4	20
		Expected Count	15.6	4.4	20.0
Total		Count	21	6	27
		Expected Count	21.0	6.0	27.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.220(b)	1	.639		
Continuity Correction(a)	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.212	1	.645		
Fisher's Exact Test				.633	.502
Linear-by-Linear Association	.212	1	.645		
N of Valid Cases	27				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.56.

RQ – 4 & SQ – 16 & 20**Personal Beliefs about Tenure & Are you Tenured p.42, Table 15****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Personal Beliefs about Tenure * are you currently tenured	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

Personal Beliefs about Tenure * are you currently tenured Crosstabulation

			are you currently tenured		Total
			yes	no	yes
Personal Beliefs about Tenure	RETAINED	Count	10	1	11
		Expected Count	8.6	2.4	11.0
	REVISED	Count	10	4	14
		Expected Count	11.0	3.0	14.0
	ABOLISHED	Count	1	1	2
		Expected Count	1.6	.4	2.0
	OTHER	Count	1	0	1
		Expected Count	.8	.2	1.0
Total		Count	22	6	28
		Expected Count	22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.661(a)	3	.447
Likelihood Ratio	2.870	3	.412
Linear-by-Linear Association	.845	1	.358
N of Valid Cases	28		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .21.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 5 & 8**Is Tenure Necessary by N/RC (school wealth) p.44, Table 16****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
nrc group * is tenure necessary?	26	92.9%	2	7.1%	28	100.0%

nrc group * is tenure necessary? Crosstabulation

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
nrc	43-45	Count	3	1	4
group		Expected Count	3.2	.8	4.0
	46-48	Count	2	0	2
		Expected Count	1.6	.4	2.0
	49-51	Count	11	1	12
		Expected Count	9.7	2.3	12.0
	52-55	Count	5	3	8
		Expected Count	6.5	1.5	8.0
Total		Count	21	5	26
		Expected Count	21.0	5.0	26.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.198(a)	3	.362
Likelihood Ratio	3.489	3	.322
Linear-by-Linear Association	.459	1	.498
N of Valid Cases	26		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .38.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 5, 15 & 19**Principal Effectiveness by Tenure & N/RC (school wealth) p. 44, Table 17****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Tenure & Principal Effectiveness * nrc group	26	92.9%	2	7.1%	28	100.0%

Tenure & Principal Effectiveness * nrc group Crosstabulation

			nrc group				Total
			43-45	46-48	49-51	52-55	43-45
Tenure & Principal Effectiveness	MORE	Count	1	1	10	5	17
		Expected Count	2.6	1.3	7.8	5.2	17.0
	NO CHANGE	Count	3	1	2	3	9
		Expected Count	1.4	.7	4.2	2.8	9.0
	Total	Count	4	2	12	8	26
		Expected Count	4.0	2.0	12.0	8.0	26.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.829(a)	3	.185
Likelihood Ratio	4.872	3	.181
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.798	1	.180
N of Valid Cases	26		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .69.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 7 & 8
Is Tenure Necessary by Gender p. 45, Table 18

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
gender * is tenure necessary?	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

gender * is tenure necessary? Crosstabulation

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
gender	male	Count	14	6	20
		Expected Count	15.7	4.3	20.0
	female	Count	8	0	8
		Expected Count	6.3	1.7	8.0
Total		Count	22	6	28
		Expected Count	22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.055(b)	1	.081		
Continuity Correction(a)	1.533	1	.216		
Likelihood Ratio	4.662	1	.031		
Fisher's Exact Test				.141	.103
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.945	1	.086		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.71.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 7, 15 & 19**Tenure & Effectiveness by Gender p.45, Table 19****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Tenure & Principal Effectiveness * gender	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

Tenure & Principal Effectiveness * gender Crosstabulation

			gender		Total
			male	female	male
Tenure & Principal Effectiveness	MORE	Count	14	3	17
		Expected Count	12.1	4.9	17.0
	NO CHANGE	Count	6	5	11
		Expected Count	7.9	3.1	11.0
Total		Count	20	8	28
		Expected Count	20.0	8.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.530(b)	1	.112		
Continuity Correction(a)	1.351	1	.245		
Likelihood Ratio	2.501	1	.114		
Fisher's Exact Test				.200	.123
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.440	1	.118		
N of Valid Cases	28				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.14.

RQ – 5 & SQ -13 & 17**Relationship between Tenure and Commitment by Gender p. 47, Table 20****Case Processing Summary**

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Tenure & Commitment * gender	28	100.0%	0	.0%	28	100.0%

Tenure & Commitment * gender Crosstabulation

			gender		Total
			male	female	male
Tenure & Commitment	MORE	Count	5	2	7
		Expected Count	5.0	2.0	7.0
	NO CHANGE	Count	15	6	21
		Expected Count	15.0	6.0	21.0
Total	Count		20	8	28
	Expected Count		20.0	8.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.000(b)	1	1.000		
Continuity	.000	1	1.000		
Correction(a)					
Likelihood Ratio	.000	1	1.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.673
Linear-by-Linear	.000	1	1.000		
Association					
N of Valid Cases	28				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.00.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 4 & 8
School Size & Is Tenure Necessary p. 47, Table 21

the top tables refer to

1= <400

2= 400-800

3= >800

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EnrollCAT * is tenure necessary?	27	96.4%	1	3.6%	28	100.0%

EnrollCAT * is tenure necessary? Crosstabulation

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
EnrollCAT	1.00 <400	Count	1	0	1
		Expected Count	.8	.2	1.0
		% within EnrollCAT	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	4.5%	.0%	3.7%
		% of Total	3.7%	.0%	3.7%
	2.00 400-800	Count	8	4	12
		Expected Count	9.8	2.2	12.0
		% within EnrollCAT	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	36.4%	80.0%	44.4%
		% of Total	29.6%	14.8%	44.4%
	3.00 >800	Count	13	1	14
		Expected Count	11.4	2.6	14.0
		% within EnrollCAT	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	59.1%	20.0%	51.9%
		% of Total	48.1%	3.7%	51.9%
Total		Count	22	5	27
		Expected Count	22.0	5.0	27.0
		% within EnrollCAT	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.173(a)	2	.205
Likelihood Ratio	3.394	2	.183
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.446	1	.229
N of Valid Cases	27		

a 4 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 4 & 8
School Size & Is Tenure Necessary p. 47, Table 21 (cont.)

the second tables refer to

2= 362-800

3= >800

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
EnrollCAT * is tenure necessary?	27	96.4%	1	3.6%	28	100.0%

EnrollCAT * is tenure necessary? Crosstabulation

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
EnrollCAT	2.00 362-800	Count	9	4	13
		Expected Count	10.6	2.4	13.0
		% within EnrollCAT	69.2%	30.8%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	40.9%	80.0%	48.1%
		% of Total	33.3%	14.8%	48.1%
	3.00 >800	Count	13	1	14
		Expected Count	11.4	2.6	14.0
		% within EnrollCAT	92.9%	7.1%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	59.1%	20.0%	51.9%
		% of Total	48.1%	3.7%	51.9%
Total		Count	22	5	27
		Expected Count	22.0	5.0	27.0
		% within EnrollCAT	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%
		% within is tenure necessary?	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.494(b)	1	.114		
Continuity Correction(a)	1.174	1	.279		
Likelihood Ratio	2.622	1	.105		
Fisher's Exact Test				.165	.140
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.401	1	.121		
N of Valid Cases	27				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 2 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.41.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 1 & 8
YrsPrinCAT * is tenure necessary? Years as Principal + Is tenure necessary? p. 48, Table 22

1 = <4 years
2 = 4-10 years
3 = 11-20 years
4 = >21 years

Crosstab

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
YrsPrinCAT 1.00	Count		3	1	4
	Expected Count		3.1	.9	4.0
2.00	Count		8	2	10
	Expected Count		7.8	2.2	10.0
3.00	Count		8	3	11
	Expected Count		8.6	2.4	11.0
4.00	Count		2	0	2
	Expected Count		1.6	.4	2.0
Total	Count		21	6	27
	Expected Count		21.0	6.0	27.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.780(a)	3	.854
Likelihood Ratio	1.206	3	.751
Linear-by-Linear Association	.059	1	.807
N of Valid Cases	27		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .44.

RQ – 5 & SQ – 2 & 8**YrsCurrCAT * is tenure necessary? Years in current position + Is tenure necessary? p. 49, Table 23****1 = <4 years****2 = 4-10 years****3 = 11-20 years****4 = >21 years****Crosstab**

			is tenure necessary?		Total
			yes	no	yes
YrsCurrCAT	1.00	Count	6	1	7
		Expected Count	5.5	1.5	7.0
	2.00	Count	11	3	14
		Expected Count	11.0	3.0	14.0
	3.00	Count	5	2	7
		Expected Count	5.5	1.5	7.0
Total	Count		22	6	28
	Expected Count		22.0	6.0	28.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.424(a)	2	.809
Likelihood Ratio	.431	2	.806
Linear-by-Linear Association	.409	1	.522
N of Valid Cases	28		

a 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.50.